

QUALITY REPORT

Cirakdami Hydro Electricity Power Plant

VCS-1506 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-A3D0656F · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project has VVB-confirmed additionality and matched claimed vs verified emission reductions for the latest monitoring period, but several cross-document inconsistencies raise over-crediting and data-reliability concerns. Leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports, and key parameters (grid emission factor and even the crediting period) conflict between recent documents.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1506
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 14.0.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	Re-carbon
Verified ERs	46,908 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	31 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large discrepancy in verified emission reductions across periods/documents (46,908 vs 373,493) indicates potential reporting/aggregation issues.
- Crediting period dates conflict between monitoring and validation documents, creating uncertainty about eligibility boundaries.
- Grid emission factor differs between two 2024 validation reports (0.4616 vs 0.53323), which can materially affect credited ERs.
- Leakage is shown as 0% while leakage justification is inconsistent (quantified vs not addressed).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB, and no material findings are reported in the monitoring report (2024-02-07).
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record; leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports.

The monitoring report (2024-02-07) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings, which supports core integrity. However, the baseline is described as project-specific and the record does not state when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens confidence in baseline validity over time. Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction, but the monitoring reports conflict on whether leakage was quantified or not addressed, which undermines the robustness of leakage treatment.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

- + Claimed and verified ERs match for the stated monitoring period (46,908 for 2022-01-01 to 2022-06-27) in the monitoring report (2024-02-07).
- Multiple contradictions across official documents (ER totals, grid factor, crediting period, leakage justification) reduce MRV clarity and comparability.

For the stated monitoring period (2022-01-01 to 2022-06-27), the monitoring report (2024-02-07) shows the same claimed and verified ERs (46,908), which is a positive MRV signal for that period. Transparency is reduced by multiple inconsistencies across documents, including conflicting grid emission factors and crediting period dates in recent validation/monitoring documents. Public-facing completeness is mixed because key eligibility labels (CORSIA/CCP) are not stated in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.
- Conflicting grid emission factors and ER totals across documents elevate over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

Over-crediting risk is elevated because the grid emission factor differs between two 2024 validation reports (0.4616 vs 0.53323), and the verified ER figure also conflicts across documents (46,908 vs 373,493), suggesting possible boundary or aggregation confusion. Leakage is treated as 0% while the justification is inconsistent between monitoring reports (quantified vs not addressed), which increases the risk that claims overstate net climate benefit. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily position claims against those frameworks.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

- + A relatively complete document set is present (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 22 documents used.
- Five corrective action requests are listed in the monitoring report (2024-02-07), indicating documentation/controls needed improvement at verification.

The extracted record indicates a strong document base (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation score. At the same time, the monitoring report (2024-02-07) lists five corrective action requests (CAR 01–CAR 05), implying that documentation and/or controls required remediation during the assurance process. Several key fields (buffer pool, baseline reassessment timing, CORSIA/CCP status) are not stated in the extracted record, leaving notable evidence gaps.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish a clear reconciliation table across documents showing monitoring periods, cumulative vs period ERs, and which totals correspond to which issuance requests (to resolve the 46,908 vs 373,493 discrepancy).
- Provide a single authoritative, dated grid emission factor calculation and reference year consistent across validation/verification, and explicitly document leakage assessment (including why 0% is justified) in the latest monitoring/verification package.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-A3D0656F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy