QUALITY REPORT

Adiguzel II Hydroelectric Power Plant

VCS-1427 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-D6372397 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	4.8
	Transparency (25%)	4.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.9
	Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed investment-test additionality and documented safeguards in the monitoring report. However, the record shows major reliability issues: the verified emission reductions differ sharply across validation documents, leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and the monitoring report contains many corrective action requests. Overall, the crediting claim should be treated cautiously.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1427
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	2015, 2017
Project Methodology	ACM0002 15
Crediting Period	2015 — 2025
VVB	BM Certification
Verified ERs	52,448 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2025
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

■ Verified emission reductions are inconsistent across validation documents, with 52,448 cited in the later validation record versus 166,012 in the earlier one.

■ The monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, while the validation record says it was quantified, creating a material inconsistency in project accounting.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports the project's core eligibility case.

- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the monitoring report, and no buffer pool or reversal history is stated in the extracted record.

The project's additionality case is stronger than average because the VVB confirmed an investment test. Still, integrity is weakened by the absence of a stated buffer pool, no reported reversal history, and leakage being left unaddressed in the monitoring report. The project is an avoidance activity, which helps on permanence, but the accounting weaknesses keep the score below mid-range.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a substantial set of extracted official documents.

- The monitoring report includes many corrective action requests, and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or usage monitoring details.

Transparency is mixed: the record identifies BM Certification as the VVB and provides a monitoring period from 2020-10-01 to 2025-01-23. However, usage monitoring details are not found in the extracted record, CORSIA eligibility is not stated, and the monitoring report contains many corrective action requests that suggest incomplete or messy reporting. The documentation is therefore usable but not especially clean.

Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

+ The project uses ACM0002 under VCS, which is a recognized methodology for grid-connected renewable energy projects.

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

Claim safety is reduced by the large discrepancy in verified emission reductions across validation documents, where the later validation record shows 52,448 while the earlier one shows 166,012. I privileged the later validation figure because it is more recent, but the contradiction itself lowers confidence in the claimed volume. Leakage is also inconsistent: the monitoring report says it is not addressed, while the validation record says it was quantified, which raises over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

+ The extraction drew on multiple official document types, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records.

- The monitoring report required numerous corrections, including template, calculation, and methodology-reference fixes, indicating documentation quality problems.

Documentation breadth is decent because the extraction includes validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and the extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report lists many corrective action requests, including missing validation details, methodology references, calculation issues, and formatting problems. That suggests the file set is complete enough to review, but not clean or fully polished.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	avoidance project, but buffer not stated
● **Leakage**	inconsistent leakage treatment
● **Baseline**	project baseline stated, reassessment not found
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled emissions accounting note that explains the discrepancy between the two validation figures and clearly states the final verified amount.

→ Provide a complete leakage assessment, including the basis for any deduction, and clean up the monitoring report to resolve all corrective action requests.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Listing Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-D6372397 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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