

QUALITY REPORT

Killik Wind Power Plant

GS-1269 · GS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-68309C96 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality, no reported reversals, and a quantified leakage deduction of 0%, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record has low extraction confidence, several corrective actions and clarification requests, and contradictions on additionality testing, leakage treatment, reversals, and the crediting period, which reduce confidence in the documentation and claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1269
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0002 3.0
Crediting Period	2018 — 2025
VVB	Re Carbon Ltd.
Verified ERs	120,869 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- Low extraction confidence and only a generic evidence-doc record make the file harder to verify independently.
- Multiple contradictions across documents on additionality, leakage, reversals, and the crediting period indicate reliability issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses ACM0002 with a project baseline and a baseline reassessment in 2020.

- The verification material lists many corrective actions and clarification requests, and the record contains contradictions on the additionality test and leakage treatment.

The project benefits from a VVB-confirmed additionality assessment, a project baseline under ACM0002, and a baseline reassessment in 2020, which are supportive signals. Integrity is weakened by the large number of corrective and clarification requests in the verification material and by contradictions on the additionality test type and leakage treatment, which reduce confidence in the robustness of the underlying assessment.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring period is stated for 2024, the verifier is named as Re Carbon Ltd., and verified emissions reductions are reported at 120,869.

- Total claimed reductions are not found in the extracted record, the usage monitoring method is not stated, and the extraction confidence is low.

Transparency is only moderate because the monitoring period, verifier name, and verified reductions are stated, but the record does not provide the total claimed reductions or a usage monitoring method. The low extraction confidence also suggests at least one key document was difficult to read, so the documentation trail is not fully reliable.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, leakage is described as negligible with a 0% deduction, and no reversal events are reported.

- CCP status is not mentioned, and the contradiction log shows leakage was previously not addressed and the crediting period differs across documents.

Claim safety is helped by the project being marked CORSIA-eligible, the leakage deduction being 0% with a negligible justification, and no reported reversal events. That said, CCP status is not mentioned, and the contradiction log shows earlier documents treated leakage as not addressed and gave a different crediting period, which raises over-crediting and claims-risk concerns.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ Eighteen documents were used, and the file includes a verification report with corrective action closure before issuance.

- The extraction confidence is low, the evidence-doc list is effectively generic, and several key fields are missing or not stated in available documents.

The file draws on 18 documents and includes a verification report where corrective actions were closed before issuance, which is a positive sign. Still, the extraction confidence is low, the evidence list is not specific, and several important items are missing or only partially stated, so the documentation quality is limited.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed but contradictory test history
● Permanence	No reversals reported
● Leakage	0% deduction with negligible justification
● Baseline	Project baseline with reassessment timing known
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not mentioned

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clean, reconciled document set that resolves the contradictions on additionality, leakage, reversals, and the crediting period.

→ Publish the missing monitoring details, including the usage monitoring method and the total claimed versus verified reductions, with clearer source documents.

Documents Reviewed

- 853 Killik wind - GS - Ver to PDFFinal_MR_853 Killik Wind _v05_13-03-2024.pdf
- Killik_WPP_Annual_Report.pdf
- Final_Ver Report_853 Killik Wind _Öykü Yakupo■lu_v03_03-04-2024_cln.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_28.08.2016 to 12.10.2018_v6.pdf
- 853 Killik wind - GS - Ver to PDFFinal_ER calculations_853 Killik Wind _v04_21-06-2023.xlsx
- 853 Killik wind - GS - Ver to PDFFinal_MR_853 Killik Wind _v04_21-06-2023.pdf
- Annual Report 2021_Killik_WPP.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_10.13.2011 to 12.31.2013_v4.pdf
- Final_ER calculations_853 Killik Wind _v05_13.03.2024.xlsx
- Final_ER calculations_661 Killik wind_v03_12-01-2022.xlsx
- Final_Val Report_661 Killik wind _Seda Atabek_v05_28-08-2022.pdf
- GS947 Passport.pdf
- GS947 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report Feedback 03.02.2011.pdf
- Killik_WPP_PDD_v9_28.08.2022.pdf
- (1)PDD 04.24.2012_v4.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1269
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1269
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_10.13.2011 to 12.31.2013.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_28.08.2016 to 12.10.2018_v3.1.pdf
- GS947 Validation Report 29.05.2012_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-68309C96 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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