QUALITY REPORT

Akcay 28.78 MW, Hydroelectric Power Plant Project (Hepp), Turkey

VCS-1174 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-97E40851 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.0
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths on paper, including VVB-verified additionality, no reported reversals, and no material findings in the monitoring report. However, reliability is weakened by major contradictions in the credited volume, the additionality basis, leakage treatment, and safeguard statements across documents, which makes the claimed emission reductions less trustworthy.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1174
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	2014, 2018
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	Rina Services S.P.A.
Verified ERs	64,201 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	23 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

■ The credited and verified emission reductions conflict sharply across validation reports, with 64,201 tonnes in the newer record versus 242,293 tonnes in an older one.

■ Leakage is not clearly justified in the monitoring report, and the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which limits claim safety.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the newer validation record cites an investment test.

- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the monitoring report, and the baseline was last reassessed in 2009.

The project benefits from VVB-confirmed additionality and a reversal-free record, which supports the core project case. Still, the monitoring report leaves leakage not addressed, the baseline was last reassessed in 2009, and the project-specific baseline approach is less robust than a recently updated standardized baseline. These weaknesses keep integrity in the mid range rather than strong.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ The monitoring period, crediting period, and VVB identity are stated in the extracted documents, and no material findings were reported.

- The monitoring report does not state a usage monitoring method, and the large discrepancy in verified emissions reduces reporting reliability.

The extracted record includes the VVB name, monitoring period, and both claimed and verified emission totals, and the monitoring report reports no material findings or corrective actions. However, the usage monitoring method is not stated in the available documents, and the large discrepancy between 64,201 and 242,293 tonnes undermines confidence in the reported figures. Overall transparency is therefore moderate.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of market-claim risk.

- The emission reduction figures conflict materially between validation documents, and leakage justification is inconsistent across reports.

Claim safety is constrained by the inconsistent emissions figures and the unresolved leakage treatment. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce one type of market claim risk, but there is no CCP status available and the contradictory records weaken confidence that the credits are free from over-crediting concerns. The project therefore sits below average on claim safety.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence.

- Several key items are contradicted across documents, including additionality basis, safeguard implementation, and credited volume.

Documentation breadth is fairly good: the record draws on multiple official documents, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report is recent, but several important items are contradicted by later validation evidence, including the additionality test type, safeguard statements, and credited volume. That lowers documentation quality despite the number of documents used.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed but contradictory basis
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
Leakage	Leakage not clearly justified
Baseline	Project baseline with old reassessment
Safeguards	Safeguards present but contradicted
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled emissions statement explaining the 64,201 versus 242,293 tonne discrepancy and identifying the authoritative source.

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and a refreshed baseline review with consistent safeguard documentation across all reports.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation

Report ID: CM-97E40851 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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