

## QUALITY REPORT

# Silivri WPP

GS-729 · GS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-8D137522 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 6.5

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	7.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a reasonably well-documented wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality, no reported reversals, and a quantified zero leakage deduction. The main weaknesses are documentation inconsistencies around the crediting period and grid emission factor, plus limited visibility on registry/claim status and some missing monitoring details.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-729
Sector	other
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 16.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
VVB	Re Carbon Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

## Red Flags

- The crediting period is inconsistent across documents, with an older verification report showing an earlier period and the monitoring report showing a later renewal period.
- The grid emission factor differs between the monitoring report and the PDD, which creates some uncertainty around the emissions baseline used for claims.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 7.2 / 10

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

- The project uses a project-specific baseline, and the record does not show a recent independent reassessment beyond the baseline update noted in 2023.

The project's additionality case is relatively strong because the verification report says an investment test was used and that additionality was confirmed by the VVB. Permanence risk is low for a wind project, and the verification report says no reversal events were reported. Leakage is addressed with a zero deduction and a negligible-leakage justification, which supports the score, although the baseline remains project-specific rather than jurisdictional.

### Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the verification report names Re Carbon Ltd. as the VVB.

- Total emissions reductions claimed versus verified are not stated in the extracted record, and usage monitoring details are also missing.

The monitoring period is clearly identified, and the verification report names Re Carbon Ltd. as the verifier. However, the extracted record does not state total emissions reductions claimed or verified, and usage monitoring methodology is not found in the available documents. That limits how fully an external reviewer can reconstruct the MRV trail.

### Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ Leakage is treated conservatively with a stated 0% deduction and a justification that it is deemed negligible.

- The grid emission factor is inconsistent between the monitoring report and the PDD, which weakens confidence in the emissions calculation.

Claim safety is helped by the project type, the VVB-confirmed additionality, and the explicit zero leakage deduction. Still, the grid emission factor differs between the monitoring report and the PDD, which introduces some over-crediting uncertainty. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

### Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ The record includes multiple official documents, and the VVB report shows several corrective and clarification requests were closed before issuance.

- One key document was only extracted with medium confidence, and the crediting period appears inconsistent across documents.

The documentation set is fairly broad, with multiple official documents available and a verification report that records several corrective and clarification requests as closed before issuance. The extraction confidence is only medium, which reduces confidence in completeness. The crediting period also appears inconsistent across documents, suggesting the record is not fully harmonized.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Wind project; no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Zero deduction with negligible-leakage rationale
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled emissions calculation package that explains the grid emission factor discrepancy and clearly states claimed versus verified reductions.

→ Provide explicit registry and market-claim status, including whether the credits are CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved, and harmonize the crediting-period references across documents.

## Documents Reviewed

- Annual Report 2021\_Silivri.pdf
- Final MR\_Silivri\_WPP\_v5\_03.02.2025\_clean(1).pdf
- 720 Silivri wind to PPFinal\_ER Calculations\_720 Silivri wind\_v03\_07-12-2021.xlsx
- Annual Report\_Silivri WPP.pdf
- Final\_Ver Report\_857 Silivri Wind\_■rem Ta■k■ran\_v03\_17-02-2025\_cl(1).pdf
- Silivri\_WPP\_Annual\_Report.pdf
- Monitoring-Report\_Silivri\_WPP\_v6\_24.10.2022.pdf
- Final\_Ver Report\_720 Silivri wind\_An■l Söyler\_v02.1\_24-11-2022.pdf
- Silivri\_WPP-Project-Annual-Report.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_20.08.2014 to 31.03.2017\_v5.doc
- Monitoring Report\_monitoring period\_01-04-2017 to 31-07-2019\_v5.pdf
- Final\_ER calculations\_857 Silivri Wind\_v04\_03-02-2025.xlsx
- Final\_ER Calculations\_721 Silivri wind\_v02\_23-06-2021.xls
- Final\_Val Report\_721 Silivri wind\_Seda Atabek\_v05\_26-09-2023.pdf
- T-V4.0-Deviation-Request-Form \_Silivri WPP\_SC\_FINAL(2).pdf
- 101.5-Transition-Annex-Silivri WPP\_wtc\_271219(2).pdf
- Final\_PDD\_721 Silivri wind\_v10\_06-09-2023.pdf
- PDD\_11.10.2016\_v4.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-729
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-729
- Verification Report\_1st monitoring period\_20.08.2014 to 31.03.2017\_v2.pdf
- Verification Report\_monitoring period\_01-04-2017 to 31-07-2019\_v3.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-8D137522 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)