QUALITY REPORT

BYZ GLOBAL ENERGY BIOGAS PLANT

VCS-2457 · VCS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-B8674879 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.1
Transparency (25%)	5.0
Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS biogas project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a recent monitoring period, but the record shows several documentation and methodology weaknesses. The biggest concerns are a project-specific baseline, missing leakage and permanence detail, and multiple corrective actions still needed in the monitoring report.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2457
Sector	biogas
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS-III.D. 21.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd
Verified ERs	168,813 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is described as quantified in the monitoring report, but the actual deduction percentage is not stated in the extracted record.
- ■ The monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including justification for methodology applicability and baseline selection, which weakens confidence in the documentation.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses the common practice test under AMS-III.D.

- Permanence and leakage are not fully evidenced: reversal events are noted as not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and the leakage deduction percentage is missing.

The project’s additionality is stronger than average because the VVB confirmed it and the common practice test was used under AMS-III.D. However, permanence is not well evidenced: reversal events are marked as not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and the leakage deduction percentage is missing even though leakage is described as quantified in the monitoring report. Overall integrity is therefore moderate rather than strong.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2019-07-30 to 2022-07-31, and the VVB is identified as TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd.

- Claimed versus verified issuance cannot be reconciled because the claimed amount is not found, and usage monitoring details are not stated in available documents.

The monitoring period is clearly identified, and the VVB is named as TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd, which supports traceability. Still, the record does not provide the total claimed issuance, usage monitoring method, or a verified usage rate, so public-facing MRV completeness is limited. The absence of these details reduces transparency even though the extraction confidence is high.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has a quantified leakage treatment in the monitoring report, which is better than an unaddressed leakage claim.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and the record does not state CORSIA or CCP status, leaving residual double-claim and over-crediting uncertainty.

Claim safety is constrained by the project-specific baseline and the lack of a stated leakage deduction percentage. The monitoring report indicates leakage was quantified, which is better than no treatment, but the record does not show CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so dual-channel claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted facts. The project therefore has moderate over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ The record draws on multiple document types, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, with high extraction confidence.

- The monitoring report still lists eight corrective actions, including missing justification for methodology applicability and baseline selection, indicating incomplete documentation quality.

Documentation breadth is decent because facts were extracted from multiple official sources, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance documents, and extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report lists eight corrective actions, including missing justification for methodology applicability and baseline selection, which suggests the file was not fully clean. The recency of the monitoring period is good, but the documentation quality remains only moderate.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed common practice test
Permanence	No reversal detail or buffer pool stated
Leakage	Leakage quantified but deduction not stated
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance present, but contradicted
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the exact leakage deduction, buffer pool treatment, and any reversal monitoring or non-reversal evidence.

→ Resolve the validation-versus-monitoring contradictions and provide complete, consistent documentation for FPIC, grievance handling, and baseline justification.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Sustainable Development Contributions Report
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report

Report ID: CM-B8674879 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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