

## QUALITY REPORT

# Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant

GS-1160 · GS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-F5C61494 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 4.9

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
■ Documentation (15%)	3.2

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a wind project with a VVB-confirmed investment additionality test, a project baseline, and no leakage deduction, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record shows many corrective actions, low extraction confidence, missing key MRV details, and a serious crediting-period contradiction that weakens confidence in the documentation and claims.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1160
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. Version 18.0
Crediting Period	2011 — 2018
VVB	Earthood Services Limited
Verified ERs	80,690 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	24 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- The crediting period conflicts between documents, and the newer validation report was privileged because it is more recent and appears to be the higher-priority source, but the discrepancy still raises reliability concerns.
- Key MRV fields are missing, including the usage monitoring method, FNRB method, and buffer pool percentage, while the extraction confidence is low.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.6 / 10

- + The validation report confirms an investment additionality test and says it was verified by the VVB.
- Leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction, but the project record does not provide much supporting detail, and reversal risk is not addressed.

The validation report confirms an investment test and says additionality was verified by the VVB, which is a meaningful positive for integrity. The project also uses a project baseline and reports a 0% leakage deduction with leakage deemed negligible. Still, reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is available, so permanence is only moderately supported.

### Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period is stated, the VVB is named as Earthood Services Limited, and the verification result reports 80,690 verified ERs.
- Total ERs claimed are not found, the usage monitoring method is not stated, and the FNRB method is missing from the available documents.

Transparency is limited by missing MRV detail: the usage monitoring method is not stated, the FNRB method is not found, and total ERs claimed are not available in the extracted record. On the positive side, the VVB is identified as Earthood Services Limited, the monitoring period is stated, and 80,690 ERs were verified. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence in the completeness of the record.

### Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline and the validation report supports additionality, which reduces over-crediting risk somewhat.
- CORSIA eligibility is true while CCP status is not mentioned, and the conflicting crediting-period records create uncertainty about claim boundaries.

Claim safety is moderate because the project has a project baseline and VVB-verified additionality, which helps reduce over-crediting risk. However, CORSIA eligibility is true and CCP status is not mentioned, so the project cannot be treated as clearly excluded from dual-market claim risk. The conflicting crediting-period information also weakens confidence in the exact scope of the claim.

### Documentation — 3.2 / 10

- + Multiple documents were used, and the record includes safeguards such as FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing.
- Extraction confidence is low, and the validation report lists many corrective actions and clarifications, indicating a documentation-heavy and somewhat messy record.

Documentation quality is weak to moderate. The record includes many documents and shows safeguards such as FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing, but the extraction confidence is low and several key fields are missing. The validation report also lists numerous corrective actions and clarifications, suggesting the file required substantial cleanup before issuance.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer pool stated; reversal risk not addressed
● <b>Leakage</b>	0% deduction with limited supporting detail
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not mentioned

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, reconciled MRV package showing the claimed ER volume, usage monitoring method, and any FNRB or baseline calculations.

→ Resolve the crediting-period contradiction with a clear document hierarchy and publish evidence on buffer treatment, reversal risk, and claim eligibility status.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring-Report\_BoreasEnezI\_v5\_24.02.2022.pdf
- Final\_Ver Report\_740 Boreas wind\_Sandeep Kanda\_v02.1\_27-02-2022.doc
- ER\_Calculations\_Boreas\_WPP\_v01\_09\_08\_2024.xlsx
- (2)Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_01.05.2011 to 31.07.2013\_v5.pdf
- Annual Report\_Boreas 2019.pdf
- OSF 740 Boreas wind to PP2019-2021 ER Calculations\_v5\_24.02.2022.xlsx
- Annual Report\_Boreas.pdf
- T-V4.0-Deviation-Request-Form \_Boreas\_24.03.2022\_FINAL.pdf
- MR\_Boreas\_WPP\_v5\_05.12.2024.pdf
- T-V4.0-Deviation-Request-Form \_v2\_Boreas\_final.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report\_2nd monitoring period\_12.11.2015 to 24.04.2018\_v6.pdf
- 30Jun\_ER calculations\_BOREAS\_WPP\_REVISED\_CC11 (1)\_010725-1047333.xlsx
- Final\_ER calculations\_530 Boreas wind\_v04\_30-05-2019.xls
- GS4GG Verification Report (PDD\_Boreas Enez I WPP\_v13\_wotc\_25.06.2019.pdf).pdf
- Emission Reduction Calculation Excel File (PDD\_Boreas Enez I WPP\_v13\_wtc\_25.06.2019.pdf).pdf
- PDD 17.07.2013\_v8.pdf
- 30Jun\_BoreasWPP\_PDD\_Revised\_final\_Clean.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1160
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1160
- GS Validation Report\_31.05.2019\_v3.pdf
- (2)Verification Report\_1st monitoring period\_05.01.2011 to 07.31.2013\_v5.pdf
- GS.VAL.25.017\_Boreas -1 WPP\_Final Validation Report\_V3.0\_10.07.2025\_CL.pdf
- Verification Report\_v03\_GS 702 Boreas-1 Enez Wind\_Öykü Yakupo■lu\_06-12-2024\_clean.pdf
- (1)Verification Report\_2nd monitoring period\_12.11.2015 to 24.04.2018\_v2.1.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-F5C61494 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)