

QUALITY REPORT

Akbas Hydroelectric Power Plant

VCS-2096 · VCS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-9CF61729 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some solid elements, including VVB-confirmed investment-test additionality and no reported material findings, but the evidence base is weakened by a project-specific baseline, an unaddressed leakage justification in the monitoring report, and several corrective actions. Overall claim confidence is moderate rather than strong because the monitoring report and validation report disagree on leakage treatment, safeguards, and the crediting period, and I privileged the more recent monitoring report for operational facts while noting the older validation report where it appears more specific on methodology.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2096
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 17.0
Crediting Period	2013 — 2023
VVB	Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. ■ti.
Verified ERs	57,264 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while the validation report reportedly quantified it; this inconsistency reduces reliability.
- Several corrective actions remain open in the monitoring report, including date, naming, staffing, and internal consistency issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the validation/monitoring record.
- Leakage treatment is weak because the monitoring report gives a leakage deduction of 0% and says leakage is not addressed, despite a contradictory validation-report reference to quantified leakage.

The project's additionality case is reasonably strong because the validation/monitoring record says an investment test was used and the VVB confirmed it. Permanence risk is low for a hydro project, but the evidence does not show a buffer pool contribution or any explicit reversal treatment, so that part is not fully documented. Integrity is pulled down by the leakage inconsistency: the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed and shows a 0% deduction, while the contradiction log says the validation report described leakage as quantified.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

- + The project has both validation and monitoring documentation, and the monitoring report provides a verified issuance figure of 57,264 tCO₂e for the period covered.
- Usage monitoring is not stated, and the monitoring report contains multiple corrective actions, which limits confidence in the completeness of public MRV disclosure.

Transparency is mixed. The monitoring report and validation report are both present, and the record includes a verified issuance total of 57,264 tCO₂e, but usage monitoring is not stated and the monitoring period is only partially informative without the underlying monitoring method. The monitoring report also lists several corrective actions, which suggests the public documentation is not fully clean or self-contained.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

- + The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of downstream claim risk.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed jurisdictional baseline, and the leakage contradiction raises over-crediting concern.

Claim safety is moderate at best. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but the baseline is project-specific and there is no clear evidence of a recent reassessment. The leakage contradiction between the monitoring report and validation report is a meaningful over-crediting risk, and the absence of a stated usage monitoring method limits confidence in the claimed reductions.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and extraction confidence is high.
- The monitoring report still lists several corrective actions, and the crediting-period dates differ between validation and monitoring records.

Documentation breadth is decent because the extracted record references validation, monitoring, PDD, issuance, and other supporting materials, and extraction confidence is high. However, the monitoring report still contains several corrective actions, including date and internal consistency fixes, which indicates the documentation was not fully polished. The crediting-period dates also differ between the validation and monitoring records, adding a small reliability concern.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● Leakage	0% deduction with contradictory treatment
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards present, but contradictory history
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible and no CCP approval stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled leakage assessment that explains the difference between the validation and monitoring reports and states the final applied deduction.

→ Resolve all open corrective actions and provide a clean, dated monitoring package with consistent crediting-period, staffing, and safeguard information.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Listing Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation
- Verification 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-9CF61729 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy