

QUALITY REPORT

Gaziantep Landfill Gas to Energy Project, Turkey

GS-1171 · CAR · Turkey

Report ID: CM-2506BD0C · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.3
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a certified landfill gas avoidance project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported in the monitoring report. However, key crediting and safeguard details are inconsistent across documents, and leakage treatment is not addressed, which limits confidence in the claimed climate benefit.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	GS-1171
Sector	methane
Country	Turkey
Vintage	2017
Project Methodology	ACM0001 18.0
Crediting Period	2010 — 2025
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	246,347 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted monitoring record, with no quantified deduction or justification found.
- Several safeguard and project-setup items conflict between the older PDD and the later monitoring report, reducing document reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.3 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses the ACM0001 methodology with a project baseline.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed, and no leakage deduction or justification is provided in the monitoring report.

The monitoring report confirms additionality through a barrier test and names Earthood Services Private Limited as the VVB, which supports the project's core integrity. The project also uses ACM0001 and a project baseline, but leakage is explicitly not addressed and no buffer pool or reversal information is available, so permanence and leakage confidence are limited. No material findings or corrective actions were reported in the monitoring report.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + The monitoring report identifies the VVB as Earthood Services Private Limited and provides a defined monitoring period from 2018-11-01 to 2021-10-31.
- Total claimed reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and usage monitoring details are also not stated.

The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period and a verified emissions figure of 246,347, but the extracted record does not state total claimed reductions, usage monitoring method, or any CORSIA eligibility status. Public-facing completeness is therefore only moderate, because several key MRV fields are missing rather than merely unquantified. The medium extraction confidence helps, but it does not offset the missing operational detail.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + The project is a methane avoidance activity with a verified emissions total of 246,347, which supports a real mitigation outcome.
- The absence of leakage treatment and the lack of CORSIA or CCP status create residual over-crediting and claim-risk uncertainty.

Claim safety is weakened by the lack of leakage treatment and the absence of any stated usage-rate or CORSIA/CCP status. The project is an avoidance activity under a recognized methodology, which is positive, but the record does not show a quantified leakage deduction or a recent baseline reassessment. That leaves some residual risk of over-crediting or overstated climate claims.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Ten documents were used, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- The record contains multiple contradictions between the PDD and the later monitoring report, including FPIC, grievance mechanism, safeguards, benefit sharing, additionality test type, and crediting period.

Documentation quality is fair because ten documents were used and extraction confidence is medium, not low. Still, the record contains several contradictions between the older PDD and the later monitoring report: the later report says FPIC, grievance mechanisms, safeguards, and benefit sharing were present, while the PDD said they were not; it also changes the additionality test type and extends the crediting period. I privileged the later monitoring report for operational and safeguard facts because it is more recent, but the contradictions reduce reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	No reversal data or buffer disclosed
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	Safeguards present but contradictory across documents
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a quantified leakage assessment, including any deduction or a clear technical justification for why leakage is negligible.

→ Publish a reconciled document trail that resolves the PDD versus monitoring-report contradictions on FPIC, grievance mechanisms, safeguards, benefit sharing, and crediting period.

Documents Reviewed

- ER GS745_Gaziantep-V04(1).xlsx
- GS745-Gaziantep_MR_V04_clean.docx
- Transition-GS 745 Gaziantep_cleanmode_V02.pdf
- Gaziantep_LFG_to_Energy_Project_Passport_v7_10072017.docx
- GS Passport_06.26.2013.pdf
- Gaziantep_Ex-Ante_Emission_Reduction_Calculation_Renewed_v1_10072017.xls
- PDD_05.22.2013_v5.pdf
- Final_PDD_452_Gaziantep_landfill_v09_11-12-2017.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1171
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1171
- GS.VER.21.49_Gaziantep_FVR 2.0.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-2506BD0C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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