

QUALITY REPORT

Aliaga Wind Farm

GS-1167 · GS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-EA6236B9 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	3.2

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

Assessment Summary

This wind project has some strengths: the VVB confirmed additionality, the baseline was reassessed in 2024, and the verification report says no extreme-event reversal was found. However, several reliability issues weaken confidence, including a low extraction-confidence flag, many corrective actions during verification, and contradictions on leakage, reversal events, and the crediting period. Overall, the project looks plausible but not especially robust from a claims-quality perspective.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1167
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 21.0
Crediting Period	2024 — 2031
VVB	Bureau Veritas (India) Pvt. Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2025
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	30 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The verification report issued many corrective actions and clarifications, which suggests documentation and implementation issues even though they were closed before issuance.
- There are contradictions across documents on leakage treatment, reversal history, and the crediting period, reducing confidence in the record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.0 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which is stronger than an unverified self-claim.
- Leakage is not well supported: the latest verification record says it was not addressed, despite an earlier document describing it as negligible; reversal treatment is also inconsistent across documents.

The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test and says the baseline was last reassessed in 2024, which supports methodological credibility. On the downside, leakage is not addressed in the latest verification record even though an earlier document described it as negligible, and reversal handling is inconsistent across the record. The report also notes many corrective actions and clarifications, although they were closed before issuance.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The project has a named verifier, Bureau Veritas (India) Pvt. Ltd., and a recent verification report dated 2026-02-17.
- Claimed versus verified emission totals are not stated in the extracted record, and the low extraction-confidence flag means at least one key document was hard to read.

The project has a named VVB, Bureau Veritas (India) Pvt. Ltd., and a recent verification report dated 2026-02-17, which helps transparency. But the extracted record does not state claimed or verified issuance totals, and key monitoring details such as usage monitoring method are not found. The low extraction-confidence flag further reduces confidence that the documentation is fully legible and complete.

Claim Safety — 4.4 / 10

- + The baseline was reassessed in 2024, which is better than an outdated baseline with no refresh.
- Leakage and reversal inconsistencies, plus CORSIA eligibility being true, increase the risk of over-claiming and dual-market claim exposure.

Claim safety is weakened by inconsistent treatment of leakage and reversal risk, both of which matter for over-crediting risk. The project is CORSIA-eligible, which does not by itself imply a problem, but it does mean the claim environment is more sensitive. The baseline was reassessed in 2024, which is positive, yet the unresolved contradictions keep the score below a strong level.

Documentation — 3.2 / 10

- + The record draws on many documents, with 28 documents used and a verification report that lists closed corrective actions.
- The extraction confidence is low, and the evidence set does not clearly state several key MRV items such as verified issuance totals, usage monitoring, or buffer pool coverage.

Documentation breadth is decent, with 28 documents used and a verification report that records closed corrective actions. However, the extraction confidence is low, which indicates at least one key source was difficult to read. Several important items are missing from the extracted record, including verified issuance totals, usage monitoring details, and buffer pool coverage.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal event in latest report, but earlier inconsistenc
● Leakage	0% deduction with conflicting justification
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessed in 2024
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of the conflicting leakage, reversal, and crediting-period statements across the project documents.

→ Provide a complete public MRV package with verified issuance totals, usage monitoring details, and any buffer or permanence safeguards clearly stated.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-01-12 to 30-06-12_v1.0.pdf
- GS388_Alia■a WPP-Project-Annual-Report-Form_2022.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01-07-12 to 30-12-12_v2.0.pdf
- Final_Ver Report_1129 Alia■a Wind_Khalid Mahmood_v03-06-09-2024_cc.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_09-04-10 to 31-12-11_v4.0.pdf
- Final_ER Calculations_1129 Alia■a Wind_v03_11-03-2024.xlsx
- Gold Standard 10.12.2024 Bergama RES.pdf
- GS 735 Aliaga WPP_Annual Report 2023.pdf
- ER Calculations_1129 Alia■a Wind_v04_14-08-2024.xlsx
- MR_1129 Aliaga Wind_V05_14-08-2024 -clean.pdf
- Alia■a Annual Report 2024.pdf
- Final_MR_GS735 Alia■a WPP_v02_16-02-2026_clean.pdf
- GS Passport_02-02-12.doc
- SDG Impact Tool_Aliaga WPP_v04.xlsx
- Final_Val Report_Aliaga WPP_An■I Söyler_v02.1_22-05-2023.pdf
- ER Calculations_Aliaga WPP_v04.xlsx
- ER Calculations_1129 Alia■a Wind_v01_16-09-2025.xlsx
- ER Calculations_v01_21052024.xlsx
- Final_SDG Impact Tool_3rd CP 1st MP_GS735 Alia■a Wind_v01_20-01-2026.xlsx
- Final_PDD_GS735_Aliaga Wind Farm_v09_16-12-2024_clean.pdf
- PDD_21-03-11.pdf
- Aliaga_WFP_PDD_v06_clean.docx
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1167
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1167
- (1)Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01-07-12 to 30-12-12_v1.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-01-12 to 30-06-12_v2.0.pdf
- Verification Report_v04_GS 735 Aliaga Wind (6th MP)_Öykü Yakupo■lu_17-02-2026_clean.pdf
- GS.VAL.23.75_FVR_V3.1_Clean.pdf
- Validation_report_rev05_02 02 2012.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_09-04-10 to 31-12-11_v2.0.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-EA6236B9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy