QUALITY REPORT

# Aydin Salavatli Dora-1 Geothermal Power Plant

VCS-120 · VCS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-4FA227EA · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

| | |
|---|---|
| **5.5** Overall Score out of 10 | |
| Integrity (35%) | 5.8 |
| Transparency (25%) | 5.2 |
| Claim Safety (25%) | 4.9 |
| Documentation (15%) | 6.1 |

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS geothermal project with VVB-verified additionality and no material findings reported, which supports moderate integrity. However, the monitoring report includes a corrected baseline calculation issue, missing meter details, and unresolved leakage and reversal treatment, which weakens confidence in the claimed reductions.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Registry | Verra (VCS) |
| Registry ID | VCS-120 |
| Sector | renewable_energy |
| Country | Turkey |
| Vintage | Stale |
| Project Methodology | AMS-I.D. 13 and 18 |
| Crediting Period | 2008 — 2028 |
| VVB | LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) |
| Verified ERs | 35,854 tCO2e |
| Monitoring Period | 2017 — 2021 |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 43 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-15 |

## Red Flags

- The monitoring report says the 2017 baseline emission was wrongly calculated and needs correction, which raises over-crediting risk.
- Leakage is only described as negligible, with no quantified deduction, and reversal risk is not addressed.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the validation report, and no material findings were reported.

- The monitoring report states the 2017 baseline emission was wrongly calculated and requires correction, and leakage treatment is only described as negligible.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test, while the monitoring report reports no material findings. That said, the monitoring report also says the 2017 baseline emission was wrongly calculated and must be corrected, which weakens confidence in the baseline and the credited volume. Leakage is only justified as negligible, with no quantified deduction, and reversal risk is not addressed in the extracted record.

### Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ The project has multiple official documents available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with a high extraction confidence.

- The monitoring report lacks key meter specifications and does not provide a verified usage monitoring method or a quantified leakage deduction.

The project has a substantial document set, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and the extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report does not state the electricity meter installation details, serial number, model, calibration entity, or validity dates, and the usage monitoring method is not found in the extracted record. The verified and claimed ER totals match in the latest monitoring report, but the earlier calculation discrepancy still reduces transparency.

### Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

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

- The monitoring report shows a corrected baseline calculation issue and the claimed and verified ER totals are tied to a disputed calculation history.

Claim safety is weakened by the monitoring report’s admission that the 2017 baseline emission was wrongly calculated, because that points to possible over-crediting. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-market claim risk, but there is no CCP status in the extracted record. Leakage is treated as negligible rather than quantified, so the overall over-claim risk remains moderate.

### Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ The record includes 43 documents and the extraction confidence is high, supporting a reasonably complete evidence base.

- The monitoring report still requires supplementation on meter details and comparison of actual versus estimated emission reductions, indicating documentation gaps.

Documentation is fairly strong because 43 documents were used and the extraction confidence is high. The latest monitoring report and validation report are available, but the record still shows missing meter specifications and a need to compare actual versus estimated emission reductions. The crediting period is long and the monitoring period is recent, which helps, but the unresolved correction request lowers the score.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| ● **Additionality** | VVB-confirmed investment test |
| ● **Permanence** | reversal risk not addressed |
| ● **Leakage** | negligible claim without quantified deduction |
| ● **Baseline** | baseline method present but calculation corrected |
| ● **Safeguards** | grievance mechanism present, FPIC not conducted |
| ● **Double-claim** | not CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a corrected monitoring calculation with a clear reconciliation of the baseline emission error and the final verified ER amount.

→ Add complete meter specifications, calibration evidence, and a quantified leakage assessment with explicit treatment of reversal risk.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation



Report ID: CM-4FA227EA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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