

QUALITY REPORT

BALIKESIR LANDFILL GAS (LFG) CAPTURE AND UTILIZATION PROJECT

VCS-2645 · VCS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-5C7072BC · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.1Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.7

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS landfill gas project with VVB-verified additionality and no material findings reported in the monitoring report. However, key MRV details are missing or not stated, leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, and permanence/reversal handling is not clearly addressed in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2645
Sector	methane
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0001 19
Crediting Period	2019 — 2026
VVB	Earthood
Verified ERs	823,666 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is contradictory: the monitoring report says leakage is quantified, while the PDD said it was not addressed.
- No verified usage rate, usage monitoring method, or buffer pool percentage is stated in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the monitoring report reports no material findings or corrective actions required.

- Reversal risk is not clearly addressed, with reversal events marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage found in the available documents.

The monitoring report dated 2024-04-21 shows additionality confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings or corrective actions required, which supports the project's core integrity. At the same time, permanence is weakly evidenced because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is found in the extracted record. The project is a landfill gas capture and utilization activity, so leakage and operational performance matter materially, but the available facts do not fully resolve those risks.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, Earthood, and a defined monitoring period from 2019-10-27 to 2022-12-31 in the monitoring report.

- Key MRV fields are missing, including the usage monitoring method, verified usage rate, and any claimed-versus-verified ERR comparison.

Transparency is moderate because the project has a named verifier, Earthood, and a clear monitoring period in the monitoring report. However, the extracted record does not state the usage monitoring method, verified usage rate, or any claimed-versus-verified ERR comparison, which limits public MRV clarity. The registry is identified as VCS, but the record does not provide enough detail to fully reconstruct issuance quality from the extracted facts alone.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The monitoring report provides a quantified leakage treatment, which is better than leaving leakage entirely unaddressed.

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

Claim safety is middling because the monitoring report indicates a quantified leakage treatment, but the PDD previously said leakage was not addressed. The baseline is project-specific rather than a standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so dual-market and over-claim risk cannot be ruled out. The absence of a verified usage rate also leaves some uncertainty about how much captured gas was actually utilized versus destroyed.

Documentation — 6.7 / 10

+ The record draws on multiple official documents, including the validation report, monitoring report, PDD, and issuance material, with high extraction confidence.

- Several important fields remain unstated, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and usage monitoring details.

Documentation quality is fairly good because multiple official documents were used, including the validation report, monitoring report, PDD, and issuance material, and extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report is recent relative to the crediting period, and the VVB is identified. Still, several important fields are unstated in the extracted record, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and detailed usage monitoring information.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	reversal risk not clearly addressed
● Leakage	leakage treatment inconsistent
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified usage monitoring method and the verified usage rate, along with a clear claimed-versus-verified emissions reduction reconciliation.

→ Disclose permanence and double-claim safeguards more fully, including buffer pool coverage, reversal treatment, and explicit CORSIA/CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- 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-5C7072BC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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