QUALITY REPORT

Kirazl■k Hydroelectric Power Plant Project

VCS-2092 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-B42D6103 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.2
Transparency (25%)	5.6
Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
Documentation (15%)	7.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS renewable electricity project using ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the extracted record. However, key MRV and accounting elements show inconsistencies across documents (notably the verified ER volume and crediting period dates), and leakage treatment is unclear, which increases over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2092
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 13.0.0
Crediting Period	2013 — 2023
VVB	EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	40,122 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Large contradiction in verified emission reductions (40,122 vs 479,318) across validation/verification documents, raising MRV reliability concerns

■ Leakage is inconsistently treated (described as not addressed vs deemed negligible) and no leakage deduction is clearly stated

■ Crediting period dates conflict between the monitoring report and the validation report

■ Safeguards/FPIC and grievance mechanism are described in later monitoring documentation but absent in the original PDD, suggesting inconsistent social risk documentation over time

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2022-12-29).

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent and no leakage deduction is evidenced in the extracted record (monitoring reports, 2021-04-13 vs 2022-12-29).

The project applies ACM0002 with a project-specific baseline approach, but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2022-12-29). Additionality is stated as confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2022-12-29), supporting integrity. Leakage is a key weakness: one monitoring report indicates leakage was deemed negligible (monitoring report, 2021-04-13) while a later monitoring report indicates leakage was not addressed (monitoring report, 2022-12-29), and no leakage deduction is evidenced, which undermines robustness.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ VVB is identified and the monitoring period is clearly stated (monitoring report, 2022-12-29).

- The extracted record lacks the claimed ER total and contains conflicting verified ER figures across documents.

The monitoring period (2021-03-01 to 2021-12-31) and the VVB name (EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited) are clearly provided (monitoring report, 2022-12-29). However, the claimed ER total is not found in the extracted record, limiting cross-checking of issuance claims. Transparency is further weakened by conflicting verified ER figures across documents, which makes it difficult for third parties to reconcile results.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

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

- Conflicting verified ER figures and unclear leakage handling increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation claims based on these credits (merged record). Nonetheless, over-crediting risk is elevated because the extracted record contains a major inconsistency in verified ER quantities across validation/verification documentation and because leakage is inconsistently justified (monitoring reports, 2021-04-13 vs 2022-12-29). CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving an additional uncertainty for claims screening.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

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

- Internal inconsistencies across official documents (ER totals, crediting period, safeguards statements) reduce document reliability.

The extracted record indicates a solid document set (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance) and uses eight documents with high extraction confidence, which supports completeness. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2022-12-29). However, multiple cross-document contradictions (ER totals, crediting period dates, and safeguards-related statements) indicate documentation consistency issues that reduce reliability despite the breadth of sources.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk evidenced
Leakage	Leakage handling inconsistent/unclear
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reported later but inconsistent with PDD
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, consistent leakage assessment and explicitly state the leakage deduction (even if 0%) with justification in the monitoring/verification package.

→ Publish or reference a reconciled ER table linking monitoring period generation, grid emission factor inputs, and issued/verified ERs to resolve the 40,122 vs 479,318 discrepancy.

→ Clarify the official crediting period dates on the registry and align all project documents to the same dates.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- 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-B42D6103 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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