

QUALITY REPORT

BOLU LANDFILL GAS TO ENERGY PROJECT,  
TURKEY

GS-1179 · Gold Standard · Turkey

Report ID: CM-6DF7701D · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

|                                                              |                       |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| <div>5.8</div> <div>Overall Score</div> <div>out of 10</div> | ■ Integrity (35%)     | 6.2 |
|                                                              | ■ Transparency (25%)  | 5.4 |
|                                                              | ■ Claim Safety (25%)  | 5.8 |
|                                                              | ■ Documentation (15%) | 5.6 |
|                                                              |                       |     |

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

Assessment Summary

This is a certified Gold Standard landfill gas-to-energy project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a documented barrier test, which supports a moderate integrity score. However, leakage is not addressed, buffer pool and reversal information are missing, and the record contains several document-level contradictions that reduce confidence in the claims.

Project Details

|                     |                                 |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Registry            | Gold Standard                   |
| Registry ID         | GS-1179                         |
| Sector              | methane                         |
| Country             | Turkey                          |
| Vintage             | 2021, 2022, 2023                |
| Project Methodology | AMS-I.D, AMS III.G 18.0, 9.0    |
| Crediting Period    | 2018 — 2025                     |
| VVB                 | LGAİ Technological Center, S.A. |
| Monitoring Period   | 2021 — 2023                     |
| Confidence          | High                            |
| Documents Reviewed  | 8 documents reviewed            |
| Scored              | 2026-04-10                      |

## Red Flags

- Leakage is explicitly marked as not addressed, with no quantified deduction found in the available documents.
- The record shows multiple contradictions across documents, including the additionality test type, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, and crediting period.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the more recent PDD describes a barrier test for the project.
- Leakage treatment is not addressed, and buffer pool or reversal protection is not stated in the extracted record.

The monitoring and validation record supports a moderate integrity view because additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the later PDD describes a barrier-based additionality case. Baseline method is stated as project-based, but baseline reassessment timing is not found, leakage is explicitly not addressed, and buffer pool or reversal protection is not stated. No material findings were reported, but the number of corrective and clarification requests suggests some weaknesses in project documentation.

### Transparency — 5.4 / 10

- + A named VVB is identified, and the monitoring period is clearly stated in the 2024 monitoring report.
- Total verified and claimed emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, limiting auditability.

Transparency is mixed. The VVB is named as LGAI Technological Center, S.A., and the monitoring period is clearly given in the 2024 monitoring report, but the extracted record does not include verified or claimed emission totals. Public-facing MRV completeness is therefore limited by missing quantitative outputs and by the absence of usage monitoring details.

### Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

- + The project is a methane avoidance activity under Gold Standard, which generally lowers over-crediting risk relative to many removal projects.
- Leakage justification is missing, and the project is marked as CORSIA-eligible without any CCP status stated, leaving some dual-claim uncertainty.

Claim safety is moderate rather than strong. The project is a landfill gas-to-energy avoidance activity under Gold Standard, which is generally less exposed than many crediting types, but leakage is not addressed and no quantified deduction is available. The project is marked as CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-claim risk is not fully resolved from the extracted record.

### Documentation — 5.6 / 10

- + The record draws on multiple document types, including the PDD, validation report, and monitoring report.
- Six corrective action requests, four clarification requests, and one forward action request indicate notable documentation issues.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. The evidence set includes the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and additional extracted material, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low. However, six corrective action requests, four clarification requests, and one forward action request indicate that the documentation package required substantial follow-up, and several key fields remain unstated.

Risk Indicators

|                        |                                                       |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| ● <b>Additionality</b> | VVB-confirmed additionality                           |
| ● <b>Permanence</b>    | No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated           |
| ● <b>Leakage</b>       | Leakage not addressed                                 |
| ● <b>Baseline</b>      | Project baseline stated, reassessment missing         |
| ● <b>Safeguards</b>    | FPIC and grievance present, but safeguards incomplete |
| ● <b>Double-claim</b>  | CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated                |

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish the verified and claimed emission totals, along with the leakage assessment and any deduction applied.
- Provide a complete safeguards and permanence package, including buffer treatment, reversal monitoring, and a reconciled explanation of the document contradictions.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_01-11-2014 to 31-07-2016.pdf
- Monitoring Report
- BoluLFG-PDD-SSC-v3-20110404.pdf
- PDD\_12.20.2017\_v12.pdf
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1179
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1179
- Validation / Verification Report

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-6DF7701D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy