

QUALITY REPORT

# Dereli Hydroelectric Power Plant

VCS-1758 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-2FF31172 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>5.4</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.2</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.6</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.8</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.4</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project has VVB-confirmed additionality and a recent monitoring period, but several internal inconsistencies across documents weaken confidence in baseline/leakage treatment and reported results. Multiple corrective action requests and contradictory statements on safeguards and grievance mechanisms increase reputational and over-crediting risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1758
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	2019
Project Methodology	ACM0002 16.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2024
VVB	Re-carbon
Verified ERs	132,934 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	32 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Conflicting verified ER figures across validation documents (132,934 vs 41,737), creating uncertainty about the credited volume.
- Leakage is taken as 0% while leakage treatment is inconsistent ("not addressed" vs "deemed negligible").
- Safeguards, FPIC, and grievance mechanism are contradictory between monitoring and validation documents.
- Monitoring report required multiple corrective actions for inconsistencies with the registered project description and missing annex/data presentation issues.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).

- Leakage is set to 0% but the monitoring documentation is inconsistent on whether leakage was assessed or justified.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, but the type of additionality test is inconsistent between documents (investment test in the 2015 validation report versus common practice in the 2022 monitoring report). Leakage is deducted at 0%, yet the monitoring reports conflict on whether leakage was assessed ("deemed negligible" in 2022 versus "not addressed" in 2024), which weakens baseline integrity for an avoidance project. No material findings are reported in the extracted record, but the number and nature of corrective action requests suggest MRV control weaknesses that can affect integrity.

### Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated (2022-01-01 to 2024-01-09) and a specific grid emission factor is reported.

- Key quantitative fields are missing or inconsistent in the extracted record (e.g., claimed ER not found; verified ER contradictory across documents).

The monitoring period (2022-01-01—2024-01-09) and a grid emission factor value are provided, supporting basic MRV traceability. However, the total claimed emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, and the verified total is contradictory across validation documents, reducing transparency on what was actually checked and accepted. The monitoring report (2024-09-03) also required multiple corrective actions for inconsistencies with the registered project description and missing annex references, which undermines clarity and reproducibility.

### Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory ER totals and changing grid emission factor values between the PDD and later validation.

CORSIA eligibility is explicitly false, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims. Nonetheless, over-crediting/greenwashing risk is increased by conflicting verified ER totals (132,934 in a 2024 validation document versus 41,737 in a 2022 validation document) and by the change in grid emission factor between the PDD (0.65716) and later validation (0.53323) without a clearly reconciled narrative in the extracted record. Leakage treatment is also inconsistent while remaining at 0%, which further elevates claim risk.

### Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (26 documents including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Multiple corrective action requests indicate documentation quality/control issues in the monitoring submission.

The extracted record draws on a substantial evidence base (26 documents including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting a mid-to-strong documentation score. However, the monitoring report (2024-09-03) triggered multiple corrective action requests, including inconsistencies with the registered project description, missing annexes, and formatting/data presentation issues, indicating weaknesses in document quality control. Contradictions on safeguards/FPIC/grievance mechanism between monitoring and validation documents also reduce confidence in the completeness and consistency of the documentation trail.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed, but test type inconsistent
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project; no reversals indicated
● <b>Leakage</b>	0% deduction with inconsistent justification
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; EF values vary
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance contradictory
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled ER accounting note that explains the difference between the 41,737 and 132,934 verified totals and clearly links each figure to the specific monitoring period and issuance event.

→ Provide a consistent, methodology-aligned leakage assessment (even if negligible) with explicit justification and references, and ensure the monitoring report matches the registered project description and includes all referenced annexes/data tables.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Registration Representation
- 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-2FF31172 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy