QUALITY REPORT

Akocak Hydroelectric Power Plant

VCS-535 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-814A4241 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4

Overall Score
out of 10

Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	6.0
Claim Safety (25%)	6.4
Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project shows moderate integrity: additionality is confirmed by the VVB and no material findings or corrective actions are reported, but baseline updating and leakage treatment are weakly evidenced. Transparency is fair with a clear monitoring period and matching claimed vs verified ERs in the extracted record, yet multiple cross-document inconsistencies reduce confidence in key figures and safeguards reporting.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-535
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 10.1
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A.
Verified ERs	557,944 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	26 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Major inconsistencies across documents for verified/claimed ER totals (256,043 vs 557,944) indicate data reliability issues.
- ■ Grid emission factor is inconsistent across validation reports (0.645 vs 562), suggesting a unit/decimal error risk that could materially affect credited ERs.
- ■ Leakage is shown as 0% while the most recent monitoring report does not address leakage justification.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.

- Baseline is project-specific and the last baseline reassessment date is not stated in the extracted record; leakage justification is inconsistent across monitoring reports.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (RINA Services S.p.A.) using an investment test, which supports additionality robustness. However, the baseline is described as project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence that baseline assumptions remained appropriate over the crediting period. Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction, but the monitoring report (2021-09-14) does not address leakage justification, and an earlier monitoring report (2012-12-10) reportedly treated leakage as quantified, creating uncertainty about whether leakage was consistently assessed.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2021-09-14) provides a defined monitoring period (2016-01-01 to 2020-06-30) and the extracted claimed and verified ERs match (557,944).

- Multiple contradictions across validation/monitoring documents (ER totals, grid emission factor, safeguards) reduce transparency and auditability.

The monitoring report (2021-09-14) clearly states the monitoring period (2016-01-01 to 2020-06-30), and the extracted record shows claimed and verified ERs are the same (557,944), with no material findings or corrective actions reported. Transparency is reduced by multiple cross-document contradictions in core quantitative inputs/outputs (ER totals and grid emission factor) and in safeguards-related statements between validation and monitoring documents. These inconsistencies make it harder for an external reviewer to reconcile what was actually validated/verified at each stage.

Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

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

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory ER totals and a potentially erroneous grid emission factor value in an older validation report.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain high-stakes aviation-related claims and reduces one channel of double-claim exposure. Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened by contradictions in both ER totals (256,043 vs 557,944 across validation reports) and the grid emission factor (0.645 vs 562), which could indicate unit/decimal issues and potential over- or under-crediting if not clearly resolved. The CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for buyers seeking CCP-aligned claims.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is indicated (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 16 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Key items remain missing or inconsistent in the extracted record (baseline reassessment timing, leakage justification consistency, safeguards consistency between validation and monitoring).

The extracted record indicates a reasonably complete documentation package (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and a relatively high document count (16) with high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation score. However, several important elements are either not stated (e.g., baseline reassessment timing, buffer pool percentage) or inconsistent across documents (leakage justification and safeguards/grievance/FPIC reporting). These gaps and inconsistencies reduce the ability to fully substantiate key quality attributes from the extracted record alone.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● **Leakage**	0% leakage with inconsistent justification
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards reported later but inconsistent across docs
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear reconciliation note (or registry-linked evidence) explaining the ER total discrepancy (256,043 vs 557,944) and which monitoring/issuance events each figure corresponds to.

→ Clarify the grid emission factor value and units (and the source year), and document any updates/reassessments of baseline parameters over the crediting period.

→ Include an explicit leakage assessment and justification for a 0% deduction in the latest monitoring/verification documentation, consistent with the applied methodology.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation

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-814A4241 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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