

QUALITY REPORT

Cakirlar Run-off-River Hydro Power Plant

GS-1257 · GS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-20087A86 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.7

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
■ Documentation (15%)	3.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated leakage treatment, but the evidence base is weakened by many corrective actions, missing key MRV fields, and low extraction confidence. Overall claim safety is only moderate because the baseline is project-specific, leakage is treated as negligible rather than robustly quantified in the latest record, and several core eligibility fields are not stated.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1257
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2020 — 2027
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA)
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The verification report lists 15 CARs and 9 CLs, with 12 corrective actions still required, which raises reliability concerns.
- Key MRV and market-claim fields are missing or not stated, including public usage monitoring details, total verified issuance, and CORSIA/CCP status.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the verification report.

- The verification report records 15 CARs and 9 CLs, and 12 corrective actions are still required, which weakens confidence in the project controls.

The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test and names RINA Services S.p.A. as the VVB, which supports the project's core integrity case. However, the same report lists 15 CARs and 9 CLs, and 12 corrective actions are still required, which suggests material implementation or documentation weaknesses. Reversal risk is not well managed in the extracted record because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is found.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- The monitoring period is stated, but public-facing issuance and usage details are incomplete because verified totals and usage monitoring method are not found in the extracted record.

~ Low extraction confidence and many unresolved corrective actions reduce confidence that the documentation set is complete and easy to audit.

The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the project has an identifiable registry and VVB, which helps traceability. That said, key transparency fields are missing from the extracted record, including the total verified issuance, the usage monitoring method, and any FNRB or usage-rate evidence. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the available documentation fully captures the public record.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline and the latest verification report says leakage is deemed negligible with a 0% deduction.

- Core claim-safety fields are missing, including CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, and any verified usage rate, leaving residual over-claim risk.

Claim safety is moderate at best because the latest verification report says leakage is deemed negligible and applies a 0% deduction, but the supporting justification is not deeply evidenced in the extracted facts. The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional or recently reassessed, and several market-claim controls are not stated, including CORSIA eligibility and CCP status. The contradiction on leakage is resolved in favor of the latest verification report, but the earlier quantified treatment means the record is not fully consistent.

Documentation — 3.1 / 10

+ The record includes a named VVB, a monitoring period, a crediting period, and multiple official documents were used.

- Low extraction confidence plus numerous CARs and CLs indicate the documentation set is difficult to rely on without further review.

The file set appears reasonably broad, with a verification report, a stated monitoring period, a crediting period, and a named VVB. However, the extraction confidence is low, and the record contains many unresolved CARs and CLs, which indicates the documentation is not cleanly complete. The crediting-period contradiction is resolved in favor of the newer verification report dated 2025-02-18, but the older period in earlier documents shows that the project history is not straightforward.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	0% deduction with limited support
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete issuance and usage trail, including verified totals, usage monitoring method, and any retirement or transfer evidence.

→ Resolve the outstanding CARs and CLs and provide a clearer, fully documented explanation for leakage, reversal risk, and baseline treatment.

Documents Reviewed

- ER_Calculations_Çakırlar_HPP_v03_16_02_2025.xlsx
- MR_Cakirlar_HPP_v04_16_02_2025_ik_clean.pdf
- Cakirlar_HPP-Project-Annual-Report.pdf
- Cakirlar-HPP-Annual-Report_v2.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_03.01.2013 to 05.31.2016_v9.pdf
- Cakirlar_HPP_Annual_Report.pdf
- 430_V1.3_IQ_SDG-Impact-tool_v1_Cakirlar HPP.xlsx
- ER calculations_Cakirlar HPP_v04_31.10.2022.xlsx
- (1)GS Passport_07.30.2010.pdf
- GS_RCP REPORT_2021XTMD14 Cakirlar HEPP_Rev 3.0Aa_11022023 (1).pdf
- PDD_04-05-2010.pdf
- PDD_Cakirlar HPP_v5_18.01.2023.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1257
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1257
- FVR_GS_VER_REP_Çakırlar HEPP_21XTMD13_Rev 3.0Aa_18022025.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_03.01.2013 to 05.31.2016_v4.pdf
- GS917 Validation Report 16.07.2014_v2.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-20087A86 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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