

QUALITY REPORT

Aliaga Wind Power Project

GS-217 · Gold Standard · Turkey

Report ID: CM-87A8B81A · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project cannot be assessed with confidence because no official documents were successfully extracted, and the record is missing the core evidence needed to judge additionality, baseline validity, leakage, and permanence. The registry status is not in the public registry, which further weakens transparency and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-217
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Turkey
Vintage	2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- No official documents were extracted, so there is no verifiable evidence for additionality, baseline, leakage, or monitoring claims.
- The project is not in the public registry, which limits transparency and increases claim and double-claim risk.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.8 / 10

- No additionality test, baseline method, leakage treatment, or reversal/buffer information was found in the extracted record.
- ~ The project is an avoidance wind project, which usually has low permanence risk, but that cannot be confirmed from the available documents.

No additionality assessment, baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool, or reversal information was found in the extracted record, so integrity cannot be substantiated from the available evidence. Because the project is a wind power avoidance project, permanence risk is likely lower than for removals, but that inference is not supported by the documents and therefore only weakly credited.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring reports, verification reports, or registry extracts were available, so public MRV transparency is very weak.
- The project is not in the public registry, reducing visibility into issuance and status.

Transparency is very weak because no monitoring report, verification report, or other official project document was successfully extracted. The authoritative registry status says the project is not in the public registry, which limits external review and makes it harder to confirm issuance and monitoring history.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- With no evidence on baseline, leakage, or verified emissions reductions, over-crediting risk cannot be ruled out.
- Registry non-appearance and missing documentation increase the risk that claims are not safely supportable.

Claim safety is poor because there is no documented basis to evaluate baseline validity, leakage treatment, or verified emission reductions. In the absence of public registry visibility and extracted evidence, the risk of over-crediting or unsupported climate claims remains high.

Documentation — 0.4 / 10

- Zero documents were used, so documentation completeness is extremely poor.
- Extraction confidence was low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable or unavailable.

Documentation quality is extremely weak because no documents were used in the extraction process. The low extraction confidence indicates that at least one key source was poorly readable or unavailable, which further reduces confidence in any assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Avoidance project, but no buffer evidence
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	Not in public registry

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verification report, monitoring report, and PDD so additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring claims can be checked directly.

→ Publish the project record in the registry and include issuance, retirement, and eligibility status to reduce transparency and double-claim risk.

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-87A8B81A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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