QUALITY REPORT

Koyulhisar Hydro Electricity Power Plant

VCS-713 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-0C34FDD9 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project has VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified, verified emissions reduction figure for the latest monitoring period, with no reported material findings or corrective actions. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (including crediting period, grid emission factor, and verified ER figures) reduce confidence in baseline/quantification reliability and increase over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-713
Sector	other
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	Re-carbon
Verified ERs	145,538 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	48 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Conflicting verified emissions reduction totals across documents (145,538 vs 127,975), creating uncertainty about credited volume.
- ■ Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2019–2029 vs 2009–2019), raising eligibility/period-of-crediting concerns.
- ■ Grid emission factor differs materially across validation documents (0.4607 vs 0.52826), which can significantly affect credited reductions.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the validation documentation.

- Baseline/quantification inputs show inconsistencies across documents (e.g., grid emission factor and crediting period), weakening confidence in the baseline and ER calculation.

The validation documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined approach, which supports additionality robustness. Leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction in the 2024 monitoring report, but an earlier monitoring report indicates leakage was not addressed, which weakens confidence in consistent application of the methodology. Baseline credibility is reduced by conflicting grid emission factors reported in validation documents (0.4607 vs 0.52826) and by an old baseline reassessment date (2011) relative to the 2022–2023 monitoring period.

Transparency — 6.6 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are present (named VVB, monitoring period stated, and a verified ER figure reported) in the monitoring/validation record.

- Several core fields vary across project documents (including leakage treatment and safeguards statements), reducing clarity and auditability.

The extracted record provides a named VVB (Re-carbon), a clear monitoring period (2022-01-01 to 2023-07-31), and a verified ER figure (145,538) in the more recent validation/monitoring record. The evidence set is broad (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance), supporting traceability. Transparency is nonetheless reduced because multiple monitoring/validation documents disagree on key statements (leakage justification, safeguards/grievance, and even the crediting period), making it harder for third parties to reconcile what was actually applied.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, lowering aviation double-claiming exposure.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by conflicting grid emission factors and conflicting verified ER totals across different reports.

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one important double-claiming channel risk. However, claim safety is weakened by quantification inconsistencies: the grid emission factor differs across validation documents (0.4607 vs 0.52826), and the verified ER total differs across documents (145,538 vs 127,975), both of which can materially change credited volumes. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity claims aligned with CCP-style expectations.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

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

- Internal inconsistencies across monitoring/validation documents indicate documentation quality control issues.

Documentation coverage appears strong, with 36 documents used, high extraction confidence, and core document types present (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance). The latest monitoring report is recent (2024-07-10) and reports no material findings or corrective actions, which supports procedural completeness. Still, repeated contradictions across documents suggest version control and consistency issues that reduce confidence in the documentation set as a coherent basis for claims.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
Leakage	0% deduction but inconsistent treatment across reports
Baseline	Project-specific baseline with inconsistent key inputs
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistently documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled, version-controlled statement of the applicable crediting period and confirm eligibility for the monitored vintage(s) with registry/issuance references.

→ Publish a clear quantification reconciliation note explaining the change in grid emission factor and the difference between the two reported verified ER totals, including calculation spreadsheets and VVB justification.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-0C34FDD9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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