QUALITY REPORT

Kargilik 24 MW Hydropower Plant, Turkey

VCS-264 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-9DD6F8A0 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.2
Transparency (25%)	6.1
Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has a clear VCS setup with VVB-confirmed additionality and matching claimed vs verified reductions in the extracted record. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (especially around verified/claimed ERs and leakage treatment) weaken confidence in the underlying accounting and increase over-crediting risk. Safeguards and grievance information appear in later monitoring but are absent in earlier monitoring, suggesting uneven social documentation over time.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-264
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 9
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. ■ti.
Verified ERs	220,348 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Large inconsistencies in reported claimed/verified emission reductions across validation/verification vintages (e.g., 220,348 vs 85,249 and 125,315), raising reliability and over-crediting concerns

■ Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction while justification is inconsistent across documents (quantified in one report vs not addressed in another)

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using a barrier analysis (validation documentation referenced in the extracted record).

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents; leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents.

Additionality is relatively strong on paper because the validation documentation confirms additionality via a barrier analysis and it is confirmed by the VVB. The baseline is project-specific under ACM0002, and the extracted record does not state when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens robustness for a long crediting period (2006-03-28 to 2016-03-27). Leakage is applied as a 0% deduction, but the monitoring report (2020) indicates leakage was not addressed while the validation report (2020) indicates leakage was quantified, creating uncertainty about whether leakage was properly treated.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated (2011-04-01 to 2016-03-27) and the extracted record shows claimed and verified ERs matching at 220,348.

- Key accounting figures conflict across documents (multiple different ER totals), reducing MRV clarity and comparability.

The extracted record provides a clear monitoring period (2011-04-01 to 2016-03-27) and a grid emission factor value (0.616), supporting basic MRV traceability. The extracted record also shows claimed and verified ERs both equal to 220,348, suggesting internal consistency within the latest figures. However, multiple documents report different ER totals, which reduces transparency because users cannot easily reconcile which numbers govern issuance without deeper registry cross-checking.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain double-claiming/dual-eligibility risks.

- Contradictory ER totals and inconsistent leakage justification increase perceived over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain aviation-related double-claiming narratives. Still, the presence of materially different ER totals across validation/verification vintages increases over-crediting risk and makes public claims harder to substantiate. Leakage treatment is also a claim-safety concern because a 0% deduction paired with inconsistent justification (quantified vs not addressed) can be perceived as under-accounting.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is present (PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) with 15 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Safeguards and grievance mechanism reporting is inconsistent between earlier and later monitoring reports, indicating uneven documentation quality over time.

Documentation coverage is fairly strong: the extracted record includes a PDD, validation report(s), monitoring report(s), and issuance evidence, with 15 documents used and high extraction confidence. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which supports procedural completeness. Nevertheless, safeguards and grievance mechanism information appears in the 2020 monitoring report but is absent in the 2010 monitoring report, indicating that social documentation may not have been consistently maintained across periods.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier analysis
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
Leakage	0% deduction with inconsistent justification
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards/grievance inconsistently documented over time
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled ER table (by monitoring period and issuance event) that explains why earlier documents show 85,249 and 125,315 while later documents show 220,348, with registry issuance IDs and dates.

→ Clarify leakage treatment under ACM0002 for this project (whether quantified or negligible) and include the calculation/justification consistently in monitoring and verification documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-9DD6F8A0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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