

QUALITY REPORT

Duzce Aksu Hydro Electricity Power Plant

VCS-2095 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-6DC3CDF1 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4

Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| ■ Integrity (35%) | 6.2 |
| ■ Transparency (25%) | 6.8 |
| ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 5.8 |
| ■ Documentation (15%) | 7.1 |

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project reports 99,931 tCO₂e for the 2022-01-01 to 2023-08-31 monitoring period, with the same figure shown as verified in the extracted record. Integrity is moderate: additionality is VVB-confirmed, but baseline reassessment timing is not evidenced and several internal inconsistencies across documents reduce confidence. Safeguards and stakeholder provisions appear stronger in recent monitoring documentation than in the original PDD, creating a disclosure reliability concern.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Registry | Verra (VCS) |
| Registry ID | VCS-2095 |
| Sector | other |
| Country | Türkiye |
| Vintage | Aging |
| Project Methodology | ACM0002 16.0.0 |
| Crediting Period | 2014 — 2024 |
| VVB | Re-carbon |
| Verified ERs | 99,931 tCO ₂ e |
| Monitoring Period | 2022 — 2023 |
| Confidence | High |
| Documents Reviewed | 25 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-02 |

Red Flags

- Conflicting verified ER values across validation reports (99,931 vs 51,842), indicating potential reporting/issuance reliability issues.
- Multiple contradictions between the PDD (2016) and later monitoring report (2024) on FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing, suggesting retroactive or inconsistently documented safeguards.
- Corrective Action Requests in the monitoring report include inconsistencies in monitored parameters and missing meter diagram/calibration details, weakening MRV confidence.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined approach under ACM0002.

- 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 validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project applies ACM0002 (version 16.0.0), which supports methodological consistency. However, the baseline is described as project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence that baseline conditions remain current. Leakage is treated as a 0% deduction with a justification of “deemed negligible” in the 2024 monitoring report, but an earlier monitoring report (2020) is recorded as not addressing leakage, creating an integrity-relevant inconsistency.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ A VVB is identified (Re-carbon) and the monitoring period (2022-01-01—2023-08-31) and grid emission factor (0.53323) are disclosed in the monitoring documentation.

- The monitoring report raised multiple CARs (including inconsistent monitored parameters and missing metering QA/QC details), and key public-claim fields like CORSIA/CCP status are not stated in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2024-01-08) clearly states the monitoring period (2022-01-01—2023-08-31) and provides a grid emission factor (0.53323), and the VVB is identified as Re-carbon. Transparency is reduced by the monitoring report’s corrective action requests, including inconsistencies in monitored parameters and missing supporting details such as a meter location diagram and calibration/serial/accuracy information. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, limiting registry/market transparency for downstream claims.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ Claimed and verified ER match in the extracted record for the latest cycle (99,931 tCO₂e), reducing immediate over-claim risk for that period.

- Contradictory verified ER figures across validation reports and unclear CORSIA/CCP status increase greenwashing and over-crediting risk.

For the latest cycle, the extracted record shows claimed and verified emission reductions are the same (99,931 tCO₂e), which is a positive signal for that monitoring period. Claim safety is nonetheless weakened by a major contradiction across validation reports: one validation report (2024-02-16) shows 99,931 tCO₂e verified, while an earlier validation report (2022-10-19) shows 51,842 tCO₂e, raising the risk of confusion or misstatement in marketing claims. With CORSIA eligibility and CCP status not stated in the extracted record, buyers cannot easily assess eligibility-related claim boundaries.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (19 documents including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Numerous CARs in the 2024 monitoring report indicate documentation quality/control issues despite overall availability.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the extracted record references a PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance, with 19 documents used and high extraction confidence. However, the 2024 monitoring report includes multiple CARs (e.g., inconsistent project proponent naming, missing footnote, inconsistent monitored parameters, and incomplete metering QA/QC documentation), indicating quality-control gaps in submitted documentation. The crediting period (2014-04-25—2024-04-24) and the recent monitoring period are stated, supporting recency, but baseline reassessment timing is not evidenced.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| ● Additionality | VVB-confirmed additionality (combined test) |
| ● Permanence | Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated |
| ● Leakage | 0% leakage with inconsistent treatment across reports |
| ● Baseline | Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear |
| ● Safeguards | Safeguards/FPIC reported later but contradict PDD |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA/CCP status not stated in extracted record |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note (or registry link) explaining the difference between the 51,842 and 99,931 verified ER figures across validation reports, including which monitoring period(s) each figure covers.

→ Strengthen MRV transparency by providing complete metering documentation (line diagram, calibration certificates, serial numbers, accuracy class) and resolving parameter inconsistencies flagged in the 2024 monitoring report CARs.

→ Provide consistent, auditable safeguards evidence (FPIC records, grievance procedure documentation, benefit-sharing description) and explain changes relative to the 2016 PDD.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- 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-6DC3CDF1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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