

QUALITY REPORT

Albay Çi■iltepe WPP Capacity Addition Project

ICR-223 · ICR · TR

Report ID: CM-F29772F0 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| 4.1 Overall Score out of 10 | ■ Integrity (35%) | 5.1 |
| | ■ Transparency (25%) | 3.4 |
| | ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 4.0 |
| | ■ Documentation (15%) | 3.1 |

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths on paper, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage treatment, but the record is weakened by missing ownership evidence, unclear CORSIA compliance, and low extraction confidence. The documentation also shows contradictions on FPIC and leakage justification, which reduces reliability and raises caution on claim safety.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Registry | ICR |
| Registry ID | ICR-223 |
| Sector | renewable_energy |
| Country | TR |
| Vintage | Recent |
| Project Methodology | ACM0002 22.0 |
| Crediting Period | 2016 — 2026 |
| VVB | Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. ■ti. |
| Monitoring Period | NA |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 17 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-13 |

Red Flags

- The documentation asks for proof of ownership, project owner/developer identification, and CORSIA compliance evidence, suggesting important registry and claim-supporting gaps.
- There is a contradiction on FPIC and another on leakage treatment, and the extraction confidence is low, so the record is not fully reliable.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.1 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses the ACM0002 methodology with a project baseline.
- No buffer pool percentage is stated, reversal events are marked as not addressed, and the verification comments request stronger discussion of operational and regulatory risks.

The project benefits from additionality being confirmed by the VVB and from a stated project baseline under ACM0002. However, permanence is weakly documented because no buffer pool percentage is provided and reversal events are not addressed, while the verification comments also ask for a stronger discussion of project risks and materiality. Overall integrity is therefore moderate rather than strong.

Transparency — 3.4 / 10

- The monitoring period is not stated, and both claimed and verified emission reduction totals are missing from the extracted record.
- ~ The VVB is named, but the low extraction confidence and missing registry details limit confidence in the public record.

Transparency is limited because the monitoring period is not stated and the extracted record does not include claimed or verified emission reduction totals. The VVB is identified, but the low extraction confidence and missing registry completeness items reduce confidence in the MRV trail. The absence of clear public-facing figures makes it hard to independently assess performance.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

- + Leakage is described as quantified, with a leakage deduction of 0%, which is better than an unaddressed leakage claim.
- The verification comments say ICR is not endorsed under ICAO CORSIA and ask for evidence of CORSIA compliance, while CCP status is not stated.

Claim safety is mixed. Leakage is at least treated explicitly, with a quantified approach and a 0% deduction, but the record does not show usage monitoring details or verified usage rates. The verification comments also state that ICR was not endorsed under ICAO CORSIA and request evidence of compliance, which increases over-claiming risk.

Documentation — 3.1 / 10

- The extraction confidence is low, and one of the available documents was poorly readable.
- The record relies heavily on a PDD, while the comments request a PDF upload, proof of ownership, and several missing methodological references.

Documentation quality is weak to moderate because the extraction confidence is low and the available evidence appears to be centered on a PDD with several missing or unclear references. The comments request a PDF version, proof of ownership, project owner/developer identification, and multiple methodological clarifications. These gaps suggest the file set is incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| ● Additionality | VVB-confirmed additionality |
| ● Permanence | No buffer pool or reversal treatment stated |
| ● Leakage | Quantified but 0% deduction |
| ● Baseline | Project baseline, reassessment timing limited |
| ● Safeguards | Grievance mechanism present, FPIC not conducted |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA eligibility stated, CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete PDF evidence pack with the PDD, ownership proof, project owner/developer registry details, and the missing verification/validation references.

→ Clarify CORSIA and CCP status, document FPIC and other safeguards consistently, and add explicit reversal, buffer, and monitoring evidence.

Documents Reviewed

- ICR 223 review report v1.0.pdf
- ICR 223 review report v2.0.pdf
- ICR 223 confirmation of registration.pdf
- EIA Document.pdf
- Final_ER Calculations_1183 Albay Wind-Val_v3_14-10-2024.xlsx
- PDD Albay Cigiltepe WPP Capacity Addition Project - v5.0.pdf
- ICR ValR ID223 v3.0_clean.pdf
- ICR ValR ID223 v3.0_tc.pdf
- ICR ValR ID223 v3.0.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-F29772F0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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