QUALITY REPORT

Koroglu Hydroelectric Power Plant

VCS-1456 · VCS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-C02F680D · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score	Category	Score
6.5 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project has VVB-confirmed additionality via an investment test and a clean verification outcome for the 2014–2020 monitoring period. However, leakage treatment is inconsistently documented across reports, and the baseline is project-specific with no clear evidence of reassessment timing, which increases over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1456
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Turkey
Vintage	2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. 17.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2024
VVB	Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. ■ti.
Verified ERs	69,434 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Leakage is inconsistently handled: the monitoring report does not address leakage while the validation report deems it negligible, yet a 0% leakage deduction is applied.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record confirms additionality using an investment test and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Leakage is applied as 0% but is not consistently justified across documents, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated.

Additionality is relatively strong on paper: the validation/verification documentation indicates an investment test and confirms additionality by the VVB. The monitoring report (2022) shows no material findings and no corrective actions required, supporting MRV reliability for the period. Integrity is reduced by a project-specific baseline approach and the absence of any stated baseline reassessment date in the extracted record, plus inconsistent leakage treatment (0% deduction without consistent justification).

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Claimed and verified emission reductions match (69,434), and the monitoring and crediting periods are clearly stated in the monitoring report (2022).

~ CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, limiting clarity for downstream users.

The monitoring report (2022) clearly states the monitoring period (2014-06-20 to 2020-06-19) and the crediting period (2014-06-20 to 2024-06-19). Reported and verified emission reductions are consistent at 69,434, which supports transparency of issuance quantities. Transparency is limited by missing public-claim metadata in the extracted record, including CORSIA eligibility and CCP status.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ Claimed and verified ERs are identical for the monitoring period, reducing immediate over-issuance risk.

- Project-specific baseline plus weak/inconsistent leakage narrative increases over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Because the verified ERs equal the claimed ERs (69,434) in the monitoring report (2022), there is no immediate sign of over-issuance within that period. However, the baseline is project-specific and the extracted record does not show when (or whether) it was reassessed, which can elevate over-crediting risk over time. The leakage approach is also a concern: a 0% deduction is applied while the monitoring report does not address leakage, weakening defensibility of claims.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

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

- Some key quality fields are missing or unspecified in the extracted record (e.g., baseline reassessment timing; CORSIA/CCP status).

Documentation coverage is reasonably good: the extracted record includes a monitoring report, validation report, PDD, and issuance records, and the minimum extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report is dated 2022-10-12, which is reasonably recent relative to the 2014–2020 monitoring period. Documentation quality is still constrained by missing or unspecified fields in the extracted record (e.g., baseline reassessment timing, CORSIA/CCP status).

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
Leakage	0% deduction but justification inconsistent
Baseline	Project-specific; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a consistent, explicit leakage assessment in the monitoring report (or cross-referenced annex) that matches the validation rationale and supports the 0% leakage deduction.

→ Disclose baseline reassessment timing and any updates to grid emission factor inputs (including the reference year) to strengthen over-crediting risk controls and buyer confidence.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-C02F680D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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