

## QUALITY REPORT

# Solar for Forest

GS-1180 · GS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-80AEB68C · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 3.6

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	3.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.8
■ Documentation (15%)	2.8

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

## Assessment Summary

This project has some positive safeguards and a verified monitoring period, but the evidence base is thin and several core quality elements are not clearly documented. The biggest concerns are weak additionality evidence, leakage treatment that is inconsistent across documents, and low extraction confidence from the available records.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1180
Sector	other
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D. 17.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
VVB	Re Carbon Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2020
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- Additionality is not clearly evidenced in the extracted verification record, and the specific test type is not stated.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent: one document says leakage was deemed negligible, while the later verification report says it was not addressed.
- No verified emission reduction figure is available in the extracted record, and the project has low extraction confidence.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- + The verification report from Re Carbon Ltd. reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.
- Additionality was not clearly documented in the extracted record, and the baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline.

The verification report by Re Carbon Ltd. reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is a positive sign for implementation quality. However, additionality is not clearly evidenced in the extracted record because the test type and VVB confirmation are not stated, and the baseline is described only as project-based. Leakage treatment is also weak because the record says leakage justification is not addressed, even though a 0% leakage deduction is recorded.

### Transparency — 3.0 / 10

- + The monitoring period and crediting period are both stated, and the project has a named VVB in the verification report.
- The extracted record does not provide a verified ERR total, and key monitoring details such as usage monitoring and FNRB treatment are not stated.

The monitoring period from 2017-10-01 to 2020-09-30 and the crediting period are both stated, and the project has a named verifier. Still, the extracted record does not include a verified emission reduction total, and key MRV details such as usage monitoring and FNRB treatment are not found. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the documentation is complete.

### Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

- + The project has a leakage deduction of 0%, which suggests no explicit leakage claim was made in the final verification record.
- The contradiction on leakage justification raises over-crediting risk, and CORSIA eligibility / CCP status are not stated.

Claim safety is weakened by the lack of a verified ERR figure in the extracted record and by the inconsistent leakage treatment. The contradiction shows one document describing leakage as deemed negligible, while the later verification report says leakage was not addressed; I privileged the later verification report because it is more recent and more directly tied to the final assurance outcome. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available evidence.

### Documentation — 2.8 / 10

- + The record includes a verification report date, a VVB name, and multiple supporting project facts.
- Extraction confidence is low, only one evidence document is identified, and several important fields are not found in the available documents.

Documentation quality is limited by low extraction confidence and the fact that only one evidence document is identified in the extracted record. Although the verification report is dated 2022-04-18 and the project facts include safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism, several key fields are missing or not stated, including verified emissions, additionality test type, and usage monitoring. This is enough to keep the documentation score below average.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	additionality not clearly evidenced
● <b>Permanence</b>	reversal risk not addressed
● <b>Leakage</b>	leakage treatment inconsistent
● <b>Baseline</b>	project baseline only
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full verification and monitoring evidence showing the additionality test, baseline rationale, and verified emission reduction total.

→ Resolve the leakage contradiction with a clear, documented justification and publish the registry status for CORSIA eligibility and CCP approval.

## Documents Reviewed

- Final\_MR\_652 Forest solar\_v06.pdf
- Final\_Ver Report\_652 Forest solar\_An■l Söyler\_v01.2\_18-04-2022 (1).pdf
- Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_01-08-14 to 30-11-15\_v3.0.pdf
- Final\_ER Calculations\_652 Forest solar\_v03\_14-12-2021.xlsx
- V3.0-Deviation-Request-form Solar for Forest Project\_GS 3305\_GSdecision[18].pdf
- PDD\_25-05-15.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1180
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1180
- Verification Report\_1st monitoring period\_01-08-14 to 30-11-15\_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-80AEB68C · 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)