

QUALITY REPORT

Kayaduzu Wind Power Plant, Turkey

GS-1272 · GS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-203B9A75 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	3.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a reasonably documented wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported reversals, but the evidence base is uneven and several key items are missing or contradictory. The project looks broadly credible, yet the lack of quantified leakage treatment, missing public MRV details, and low extraction confidence keep the score in the middle range.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1272
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0002 3.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2026
VVB	Re Carbon Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- Several core fields are not stated in the extracted record, including buffer pool treatment, usage monitoring, and verified issuance totals.
- The extracted record contains contradictions on additionality test type, benefit sharing, leakage treatment, reversal treatment, and crediting period, which reduces reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.0 / 10

- + The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test and says the VVB validated it.
- Leakage is only described as negligible, with no quantified deduction shown in the extracted record, and the record contains a contradiction on whether leakage was previously addressed.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the verification report confirms additionality through an investment test, and the VVB is named as Re Carbon Ltd. The monitoring record also says no reversal events were reported. However, leakage is only described as negligible without a quantified deduction, and the extracted record shows a contradiction on leakage treatment, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the crediting assumptions.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined 2024 monitoring period, and a recent verification date in the extracted documents.
- Verified and claimed issuance totals are not found, and the usage monitoring method and FNRB treatment are not stated in the available documents.

Transparency is moderate because the project has a named verifier and a clearly defined 2024 monitoring period, with a recent report date. That said, the extracted record does not provide verified or claimed ERR totals, does not state the usage monitoring method, and does not include FNRB details. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the public documentation is complete.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The baseline method is stated as project-based and the baseline was last reassessed in 2021, which is better than an unstated baseline.
- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-claim risk is not fully resolved.

Claim safety is middling. The baseline method is stated as project-based and the baseline was last reassessed in 2021, which is better than an unstated baseline, but the record does not provide the quantified leakage deduction or any usage-rate evidence. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so the dual-claim picture is incomplete and warrants caution.

Documentation — 3.4 / 10

- + The record draws on many extracted documents and includes a 2024 verification report with multiple corrective actions closed before issuance.
- Extraction confidence is low, and the record still lacks several key fields such as buffer pool treatment, usage monitoring, and verified ERR totals.

Documentation quality is limited by low extraction confidence and by several missing core fields, including buffer pool treatment, usage monitoring, FNRB, and verified issuance totals. On the positive side, the record references many source documents and the verification report notes that multiple corrective action and clarification requests were closed before issuance. The contradiction set also suggests the underlying document trail is not fully consistent across versions.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversals reported, buffer not stated
● Leakage	Negligible stated, no quantified deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified and claimed emission reduction totals, along with the usage monitoring method and any leakage calculation or deduction.

→ Resolve document inconsistencies by issuing a reconciled project record that explains the differing additionality, leakage, reversal, and crediting-period statements.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_07.01.2012 to 04.30.2014_v5.pdf
- Kayaduzu_HEPP_Annual_Report.pdf
- Kayaduzu-WPP-Annual-Report.pdf
- Final_Ver Report_852 Kayaduzu Wind_Selen Cilasun_v04_18-09-2023-clean.pdf
- Final_MR_852 Kayaduzu Wind_v06_26-08-2024-clean.docx
- Kayaduzu_WPP-Project-Annual-Report.pdf
- Annual Report 2021_Kayaduzu_WPP.pdf
- MR v5_Kayadüzü WPP_wtc_290120.pdf
- Final_ER calculations_852 Kayaduzu Wind_v05_17-09-2024.xlsx
- Final_Val Report_660 Kayaduzu_wind_Seda Atabek_v04_09-02-2023.pdf
- (1)GS950 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report 22.10.2010.pdf
- (1)GS Passport 04.25.2012.pdf
- Final_ER calculations_660 Kayaduzu wind_v02_21-08-2021.xls
- Final_PDD_660 Kayaduzu wind_v16_13-01-2023.pdf
- (1)PDD 04.16.2013_v11.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1272
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1272
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_27.08.2016 to 30.06.2019_v3.pdf
- GS950 Validation Report 11.10.2012_v4.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_07.01.2012 to 04.30.2014.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-203B9A75 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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