

QUALITY REPORT

Bulam 7MW HEPP

GS-1115 · GS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-E6AF3EFA · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.4
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

Assessment Summary

This is a small hydro project with some positive signs, including an investment-test additionality claim, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism. However, the record has meaningful gaps and one direct contradiction on leakage treatment, and the verification report also records multiple corrective findings, which weakens confidence in the crediting claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1115
Sector	other
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 011
Crediting Period	2010 — 2017
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2015
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- The verification report recorded 09 CARs, 03 CLs, and 01 FAR, indicating substantial issues during verification.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the monitoring report says leakage was deemed negligible, while the verification report says it was not addressed.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.4 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline and the additionality test type is stated as an investment test in the verification record.
- Leakage is inconsistent across documents, and the verification report records multiple corrective findings.

The project has some support for additionality because the verification record identifies an investment test, and the baseline method is project-based. On the downside, the verification report records 09 CARs, 03 CLs, and 01 FAR, which suggests material implementation or documentation issues. Leakage is not robustly handled: the monitoring report says it was deemed negligible, but the verification report says it was not addressed, so confidence in the integrity of the accounting is reduced.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and four evidence documents were used.
- Verified and claimed emission reduction totals are not stated in the extracted record, limiting public MRV clarity.

Transparency is moderate because the project has a named VVB, a stated monitoring period, and multiple source documents were used. However, the extracted record does not provide verified or claimed emission reduction totals, and several operational details such as usage monitoring and grid factor inputs are not found in the available documents. The medium extraction confidence also suggests the record is incomplete or partially difficult to read.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

- + The project is a small hydro activity with FPIC and grievance mechanisms documented, which helps reduce some safeguard-related risk.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and leakage treatment is disputed.

Claim safety is weakened by the project-specific baseline and the unresolved leakage treatment, both of which increase over-crediting risk. The project does have some safeguard documentation, including FPIC and a grievance mechanism, which helps, but that does not offset the accounting uncertainty. No CORSIA or CCP status is stated, so channel-specific claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + The record includes a verification report, monitoring report, PDD, and another document, with medium extraction confidence.
- One key document was not clearly identified and the verification report is dated 2016, while the crediting period extends beyond that point.

The documentation set is reasonably broad, with a verification report, monitoring report, PDD, and another document listed, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low. Still, important fields are missing, including verified emission totals, buffer pool information, and several methodological details. The verification report is also older than the end of the crediting period, so recency is only partial.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test stated, but VVB confirmation not found
● Permanence	Hydro project with no buffer or reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent across documents
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, but not recently reassessed
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present, but documentation is p
● Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, reconciled leakage assessment and explain why the monitoring report and verification report differ.

→ Publish the verified emission reduction totals, baseline recalculation details, and any VVB corrective action closure evidence.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01-08-10 to 31-07-15_v4.0.pdf
- GS Passport_29-02-12.pdf
- PDD_29-02-12.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1115
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1115
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01-08-10 to 31-07-15_v3.0.pdf

Disclaimer

This Quality Report is an independent editorial assessment generated by CarbonMeld's automated analysis pipeline. It is based solely on publicly available registry documents and marketplace metadata at the time of analysis.

CarbonMeld does not have access to non-public project information, internal project documentation, or confidential communications with project developers. The analysis pipeline may not have retrieved all publicly available documents for this project.

This report does not constitute an audit, certification, financial recommendation, investment advice, or guarantee of environmental outcome. It does not replace professional due diligence by the buyer or any party relying on this information.

CarbonMeld is not a registry, certification body, or financial advisor. Scores reflect evidence available at the time of analysis and may change as new documentation becomes available. CarbonMeld shall not be liable for any decision to purchase, sell, trade, or otherwise transact carbon credits based in whole or in part on the scores or content of this report.

Report ID: CM-E6AF3EFA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy