

QUALITY REPORT

DAGBASI HYDROELECTRIC POWER PLANT

VCS-1333 · VCS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-72811D24 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	7.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.8

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected hydropower avoidance project under VCS with emissions reductions fully matched between claimed and verified totals for the monitored period. Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, but baseline setting is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated. Safeguards-related disclosures are inconsistent across documents, which increases reputational and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1333
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Turkey
Vintage	2014, 2015, 2016, 2017
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. 17.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2024
VVB	Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. ■ti.
Verified ERs	57,843 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are reported in the 2022 monitoring report but were not reported in the 2014 validation report, creating a documentation consistency risk.
- Baseline is project-specific and the date of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.6 / 10

+ The verification/monitoring record shows additionality confirmed by the VVB via an investment test and no material findings or corrective actions reported (monitoring report, 2022).

- Leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, which weakens robustness for long monitoring periods (monitoring report, 2022).

Additionality is relatively strong because the VVB confirmed an investment test (monitoring report, 2022). The baseline is described as project-specific rather than standardized, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, which adds uncertainty over a multi-year monitoring period (monitoring report, 2022). Leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction; while this can be reasonable for grid-connected renewables, the extracted record does not provide detailed justification beyond the negligible designation (monitoring report, 2022).

Transparency — 7.2 / 10

+ Claimed and verified emissions reductions are identical (57,843 tCO₂e) for the stated monitoring period, supporting MRV consistency (monitoring report, 2022).

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, limiting registry/eligibility transparency for buyers.

The monitoring period is clearly stated (2014-04-11 to 2020-04-10) and the claimed and verified totals match exactly at 57,843 tCO₂e, which supports transparent MRV outcomes (monitoring report, 2022). The VVB is identified (Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. ■ti.), and no material findings or corrective actions are reported (monitoring report, 2022). However, CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, limiting transparency on downstream claim pathways.

Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ The project uses a recognized small-scale renewable electricity methodology (AMS-I.D. v17.0) with a stated grid emission factor (monitoring report, 2022).

- Safeguards and stakeholder-process claims are inconsistent across validation vs monitoring documentation, increasing greenwashing/reputational risk (validation report, 2014; monitoring report, 2022).

Over-crediting risk is moderated by the exact match between claimed and verified ERs and the use of an established renewable electricity methodology (AMS-I.D. v17.0) with a stated grid emission factor of 0.5299 (monitoring report, 2022). Claim safety is weakened by the project-specific baseline approach and the lack of a stated baseline reassessment date in the extracted record, which can matter for grid EF evolution over time. In addition, safeguards-related statements differ between early and later documents, which can elevate reputational/greenwashing risk for corporate claims (validation report, 2014; monitoring report, 2022).

Documentation — 7.8 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and extraction confidence is high.

- Contradictions between the validation report (2014) and monitoring report (2022) on safeguards-related items reduce confidence in narrative completeness.

Documentation coverage is fairly good: the extracted record includes a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance evidence, with six documents used and high extraction confidence. The monitoring report is relatively recent (2022-11-21) compared with the crediting period start (2014-04-11), supporting recency for MRV. The main documentation weakness is internal inconsistency on safeguards-related disclosures between the validation report (2014) and monitoring report (2022), which reduces confidence in completeness and continuity of stakeholder-process reporting.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● Leakage	0% leakage with limited justification detail
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, consistent safeguards narrative across validation and monitoring, including dated evidence of FPIC, grievance mechanism operation, and benefit-sharing implementation.

→ Disclose baseline reassessment timing and supporting calculations (including any grid EF updates) and provide fuller leakage justification for the 0% deduction.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-72811D24 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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