QUALITY REPORT

Tepekisla Dam & Hydropower Plant Project

VCS-2097 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-BB4190D7 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	6.1
	Transparency (25%)	6.4
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
	Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project shows some core integrity strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality and matching claimed vs verified emission reductions in the most recent extracted record. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (especially around ER totals, crediting period dates, and safeguards/FPIC statements) and weak leakage treatment reduce confidence and increase over-crediting and reputational risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2097
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 15.0
Crediting Period	2015 — 2025
VVB	RINA
Verified ERs	214,834 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	16 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Large contradiction in reported emission reductions (214,834 vs 417,351) across validation reports, indicating data reliability issues.
- ■ Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction while leakage justification is missing in the monitoring report and only described as “quantified” elsewhere.
- ■ Crediting period dates conflict between documents (2015–2025 vs 2025–2035), creating uncertainty about what period the ERs relate to.
- ■ Safeguards/FPIC and grievance mechanism are inconsistently reported across documents, increasing social-risk uncertainty.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification record; VVB: RINA).

- Leakage is treated as 0% with missing or inconsistent justification across documents (monitoring report 2024 vs validation report 2024).

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (RINA), which supports additionality robustness. Baseline setting is project-specific under ACM0002, and the baseline is stated as reassessed in 2025, but the grid EF vintage is not clearly stated in the extracted record, limiting baseline scrutiny. Leakage is applied as a 0% deduction while the monitoring report (2024-02-22) does not address leakage justification, which weakens integrity for an ACM0002 grid-connected renewable project where leakage should at least be explicitly justified. No reversal events are reported, which is generally consistent with an avoidance-type renewable energy project, but permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool) are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated (2020-09-01 to 2023-11-30) and the extracted record shows claimed ERs equal verified ERs (monitoring/validation record).

- Key parameters and narrative elements are inconsistent across official documents (ER totals, crediting period, safeguards), reducing transparency and traceability.

The monitoring period is clearly defined (2020-09-01—2023-11-30) and the extracted record shows claimed ERs equal verified ERs (214,834), which is a positive MRV signal for that specific figure. The project uses a recognized VCS methodology (ACM0002 v15.0) and identifies the VVB (RINA). However, multiple inconsistencies across official documents (including ER totals and crediting period dates) reduce the ability for an external reviewer to reconcile what was monitored, validated, and ultimately issued. Some key monitoring-related fields (e.g., usage monitoring method) are not found in the extracted record, though this is less central for grid-connected hydropower than for household energy projects.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The most recent extracted ER figure shows no discrepancy between claimed and verified (214,834), lowering immediate over-issuance risk for that period.

- CORSIA eligibility is not stated in the extracted record and ER totals conflict across validation reports, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Over-crediting/claim risk is elevated by the contradiction in total emission reductions between validation reports (417,351 in 2021-06-24 vs 214,834 in 2024-04-19), even though the most recent extracted figure matches claimed and verified for 214,834. Leakage treatment is not consistently supported: the monitoring report (2024-02-22) does not address leakage justification while a later validation report (2024-04-19) describes leakage as “quantified,” creating uncertainty about whether leakage was properly handled. CORSIA eligibility is not stated in the extracted record and CCP status is not mentioned, so buyers cannot easily assess aviation/CCP-related claim constraints. The baseline is project-specific, which generally carries higher over-crediting risk than standardized/jurisdictional baselines unless transparently justified and consistently documented.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 12 documents used.

- A corrective action request indicates basic project specification inconsistencies (turbine capacity/type) that should have been harmonized across core documents.

The extracted record references a reasonably complete set of evidence documents (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and indicates 12 documents were used with high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation score. The monitoring report is recent (2024-02-22) relative to the monitoring period end (2023-11-30), which is a positive recency signal. However, a corrective action request notes inconsistencies between the license/FSR and project documentation on turbine capacity and type, indicating document control issues. In addition, contradictions on safeguards/FPIC and crediting period dates suggest that key statements vary across versions and should be better harmonized and traceable.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
Leakage	0% leakage with weak/inconsistent justification
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear in practice
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC disclosures conflict across documents
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not clearly stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note explaining the ER total change (417,351 to 214,834), including which monitoring periods and calculation updates drove the revision, and align all public documents accordingly.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment text consistent across validation and monitoring (even if 0%), including the rationale under ACM0002 and any quantified components.

→ Resolve and standardize crediting period dates across registry-facing documents and reports, with version control and references to VCS registration/renewal decisions.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-BB4190D7 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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