

QUALITY REPORT

KAYSERI MOLU LANDFILL GAS TO ENERGY PROJECT, TURKEY

GS-48 · Gold Standard · Turkey

Report ID: CM-BB08521E · Generated: 2026-04-11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a certified Gold Standard landfill gas-to-electricity project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a project baseline, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record shows weak leakage treatment in the verification report, many corrective actions, low extraction confidence, and several missing or inconsistent data points that reduce confidence in the claimed climate benefit.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-48
Sector	methane
Country	Turkey
Vintage	2014, 2015, 2016
Project Methodology	ACM0001 13.0.0
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA)
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2021
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	25 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-11

Red Flags

- Leakage is described as not addressed in the verification report, even though the monitoring report later says it was deemed negligible.
- The verification report records 44 corrective action requests and 6 clarification requests in one verification cycle, plus a forward action request for the next verification.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses the ACM0001 methodology with a project baseline.
- Leakage treatment is weak because the verification report says it was not addressed, and no buffer pool or reversal information is found.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and identifies the project as using ACM0001 with a project baseline, which supports the core project logic. Integrity is pulled down by the leakage treatment: the verification report says leakage was not addressed, while the later monitoring report says it was deemed negligible, so the evidence is mixed and not fully robust. No buffer pool percentage or reversal events are found in the extracted record, so permanence evidence is limited even for an avoidance project.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a Gold Standard registry record.
- Claimed versus verified emission reduction totals are not stated, and key monitoring details such as usage monitoring and baseline reassessment are missing.

Transparency is moderate because the project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a clear registry identity under Gold Standard. However, the extracted record does not state claimed versus verified emission reductions, usage monitoring method, or baseline reassessment timing, which limits auditability. The low extraction confidence also suggests at least one key document was difficult to read, reducing confidence in the completeness of the public record.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project is an avoidance project in the methane sector, which generally lowers reversal risk compared with removals.
- Leakage justification is inconsistent across documents, and no CORSIA or CCP status is stated, leaving residual double-claim and over-crediting uncertainty.

Claim safety is weakened by the inconsistent leakage treatment: one document says leakage was not addressed, while a later monitoring report says it was negligible. The project is a methane avoidance activity, which is generally safer than removals, but the absence of CORSIA and CCP status means dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record. Missing values for usage rates and other operational parameters also leave some over-crediting uncertainty.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, including validation, monitoring, and verification reports, and safeguards are at least partially documented through FPIC and a grievance mechanism.
- Extraction confidence is low, several key fields are not stated, and the verification report contains many corrective actions, which weakens documentation quality.

Documentation quality is mixed. The record includes multiple official documents and shows safeguards elements such as FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing, but the extraction confidence is low and several key fields are not stated. The verification report also lists many corrective action requests and a forward action request, indicating that the documentation required substantial follow-up before issuance.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	avoidance project, but no buffer or reversal evidence
● Leakage	leakage treatment inconsistent across documents
● Baseline	project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present, but not fully document
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled emissions accounting package showing claimed versus verified reductions, leakage treatment, and the basis for any deductions.

→ Provide a complete, readable set of validation, monitoring, and verification documents with explicit baseline reassessment, buffer/permanence treatment, and registry double-claim status.

Documents Reviewed

- Final_ER calculations_792 Kayseri landfill_v06_10-08-2022.xlsx
- Final_MR_792 Kayseri landfill_v06_10-08-2022.pdf
- Final_Ver Report 426 Kayseri landfill_v02_23-10-2021.pdf
- Final_MR_426 Kayseri landfill_v12_27-12-2021.pdf
- Final_Ver Report_792 Kayseri landfill_Sandeep Kanda_v01.1_10-08-2022.pdf
- T-V4.0-Deviation-Request-Form_KayseriLFG(1).pdf
- Final_ER Calculations_426 Kayseri landfill_v11_16-06-2021.xlsx
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01-12-2011 to 31-03-2014_v9.doc
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.12.2011 to 31.03.2014_v9.doc
- Monitoring Report
- PD_24-03-2014.doc
- GS_Passport_Kayseri_Molu_LF_06.doc
- DEV_239 Deviation Request.pdf
- (1)GS Passport 24.03.2014.doc
- GS1061 CM_2013.02.06_v4.xlsx
- T-V1.0-Transition-1061_KayseriLFG_v01.pdf
- GS Passport_24-03-2014.doc
- PDD_10-12-2013.doc
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-48
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-48
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01.12.2011 to 31.03.2014_v1.3Aa.pdf
- GS1061 Validation Report_09.04.2014_v5.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01-12-2011 to 31-03-2014_v1.3.pdf
- Validation / Verification Report

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-BB08521E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-11 · Generated: 2026-04-11

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