

QUALITY REPORT

The Cevizlik Run-Of-River Hydroelectric Power Plant

VCS-753 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-6627D557 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4Overall 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 run-of-river hydro project shows moderate integrity: additionality is confirmed by the VVB via an investment test and the latest monitoring/verification record reports no material findings. However, baseline and leakage treatment are weakly evidenced, and multiple cross-document inconsistencies (ERR totals, grid emission factor, crediting period, and safeguards) reduce confidence in the underlying data quality.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-753
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2020 — 2030
VVB	Rüzgar Danışmanlık
Verified ERs	414,078 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	31 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Conflicting ERR totals across validation reports (335,015 vs 414,078) create over-crediting and data reliability risk.
- Leakage is taken as 0% while the monitoring report does not address leakage justification, conflicting with a validation report that says leakage was quantified.
- Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2010–2020 vs 2020–2030), raising concerns about period alignment and issuance basis.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record confirms additionality using an investment test and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

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

The validation/verification record confirms additionality via an investment test, and the extracted record shows no material findings and no corrective actions required (validation/verification documentation referenced in the merged record). The baseline approach is project-specific under ACM0002, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the available documents, which weakens baseline robustness. Leakage is applied as a 0% deduction, but the monitoring report (2023-12-27) does not address leakage justification, creating uncertainty about whether leakage was appropriately assessed.

Transparency — 6.6 / 10

+ A recent monitoring report (2023-12-27) provides a defined monitoring period (2020-05-29 to 2023-06-30) and the claimed and verified ERs match in the extracted record (414,078).

- Key figures vary across documents (grid emission factor and ER totals), reducing MRV clarity and comparability.

The monitoring report dated 2023-12-27 clearly states the monitoring period (2020-05-29 to 2023-06-30) and the extracted record shows the same total ERs claimed and verified (414,078), which supports MRV consistency within that document set. However, transparency is reduced by cross-document discrepancies in key parameters, including the grid emission factor and ER totals between validation/monitoring records. The VVB is identified (Rüzgar Danışmanlık), but the conflicting values suggest version control issues that make it harder for third parties to reconcile the public record.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

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

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

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-impact aviation-related claims. Over-crediting risk remains moderate because the ER totals differ across validation reports (335,015 vs 414,078) and because leakage justification is inconsistent (monitoring report says it is not addressed while a validation report says it was quantified). The baseline is project-specific and the baseline reassessment timing is not stated, which further increases uncertainty around the conservativeness of credited reductions.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 17 documents used.

- Multiple internal inconsistencies across official documents indicate documentation control/versioning weaknesses.

The extracted record references a broad evidence set (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and indicates 17 documents were used with high extraction confidence, supporting a relatively strong documentation score. Nonetheless, multiple contradictions across official documents (including crediting period, safeguards, and key quantification parameters) indicate weaknesses in document consistency and traceability. No corrective actions are listed in the extracted record, but the inconsistencies themselves warrant caution.

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 recently but inconsistent historically
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note (or updated verification/issuance statement) explaining the change in ER totals (335,015 vs 414,078) and which figure was ultimately issued for which monitoring period.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment text consistent across validation and monitoring reports (even if leakage is negligible) and cite the applicable ACM0002 leakage provisions used.

→ Clarify and standardize the crediting period across all public documents and registry entries, including any renewal/transition rationale and the exact periods covered by each monitoring report.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- 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-6627D557 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy