

## QUALITY REPORT

# Otluca Hpps Run-Of-River Hydro Project

VCS-755 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-D0B9BFD0 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>6.6</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.2</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>6.8</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>6.4</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>7.6</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This VCS run-of-river hydro project shows moderate integrity: additionality is VVB-confirmed via an investment test and the verified ERs match the claimed ERs for the latest monitoring. However, leakage treatment is weakly evidenced and multiple cross-document inconsistencies (ER totals, crediting period, safeguards) reduce confidence in the reliability of the record.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-755
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 21.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2031
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+)
Verified ERs	532,381 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	25 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Conflicting ER totals across validation documents (241,701.5 vs 532,381) create over-crediting and data reliability risk.
- Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2011–2021 vs 2021–2031), raising questions about period alignment and issuance basis.
- Leakage is taken as 0% while the monitoring report does not address leakage justification, weakening baseline/leakage robustness.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).

- Leakage is deducted at 0% but the monitoring report (2023-03-10) does not address leakage justification.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the extracted record indicates an investment test and that additionality was confirmed by the VVB (Applus+). Baseline setting is project-specific under ACM0002 and the baseline was last reassessed in 2020, which is a positive sign but still less robust than a standardized/jurisdictional baseline. Leakage treatment is a weakness: the monitoring report (2023-03-10) does not address leakage justification while applying a 0% leakage deduction, which reduces confidence that all relevant effects were considered. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which supports integrity but does not offset the leakage and inconsistency issues.

### Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2023-03-10) provides a clear monitoring period (2019-08-01 to 2022-05-31) and reports ERs that match claimed and verified totals (532,381).

- Key baseline inputs are incomplete in the extracted record (e.g., grid EF year not stated), and several headline figures conflict across documents.

The monitoring report (2023-03-10) specifies the monitoring period (2019-08-01 to 2022-05-31) and reports total emission reductions where claimed and verified totals match (532,381), supporting MRV clarity for that period. The VVB is named (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+)), which helps trace assurance. However, some key parameters are not fully specified in the extracted record (e.g., the grid emission factor year is not stated), and multiple cross-document contradictions (ER totals, crediting period, safeguards) reduce transparency and user confidence in which version is authoritative.

### Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

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

- Contradictory ER totals and crediting-period dates increase over-crediting and misrepresentation risk for downstream claims.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain high-stakes aviation-related claims and reduces one pathway for double-claim concerns. Nonetheless, over-crediting/claim risk is elevated by inconsistencies in reported ER totals across validation documents and by conflicting crediting-period dates across monitoring reports, which can confuse what vintage/period the credits represent. Leakage is another claim-safety concern because a 0% deduction is applied while the monitoring report (2023-03-10) does not provide a leakage justification, making it harder for buyers to defend claims against scrutiny. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving an evidence gap on high-integrity label alignment.

## Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 18 documents used.

- Multiple contradictions between older and newer documents indicate record-keeping/version-control weaknesses.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the extracted record references a PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance, with 18 documents used and high extraction confidence. The monitoring report (2023-03-10) includes safeguards-related elements (FPIC conducted, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing described), which improves completeness for social risk documentation. However, repeated contradictions between older and newer documents (including safeguards presence and key quantitative figures) indicate version-control and consistency problems that reduce documentation reliability even when documents exist.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	0% leakage with weak/absent justification
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing limited
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards reported but inconsistent across documents
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear, reconciled statement explaining the ER total discrepancy (241,701.5 vs 532,381) and how it maps to monitoring periods, vintages, and issuance.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment and justification in the monitoring report (even if deemed negligible) consistent with ACM0002 requirements and project context.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- 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-D0B9BFD0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)