

## QUALITY REPORT

# Grid Connected Electricity Generation From Renewable Sources: Uzuncayir 82.0 MW Hydroelectric Power Plant Project, Turkey

VCS-762 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-8247D551 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.6**Overall Score  
out of 10

|                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| ■ Integrity (35%)     | 5.2 |
| ■ Transparency (25%)  | 6.0 |
| ■ Claim Safety (25%)  | 5.4 |
| ■ Documentation (15%) | 6.4 |

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a VCS renewable electricity project using ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB and a recent grid emission factor update referenced for 2021. However, multiple corrective actions in the 2022 monitoring/verification cycle and several cross-document inconsistencies (including crediting period and ER figures) raise over-crediting and data reliability concerns.

## Project Details

|                     |                                  |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Registry            | Verra (VCS)                      |
| Registry ID         | VCS-762                          |
| Sector              | renewable_energy                 |
| Country             | Türkiye                          |
| Vintage             | Stale                            |
| Project Methodology | ACM0002 20.0                     |
| Crediting Period    | 2019 — 2029                      |
| VVB                 | 4K Earth Science Private Limited |
| Verified ERs        | 171,708 tCO <sub>2</sub> e       |
| Monitoring Period   | 2019 — 2021                      |
| Confidence          | Medium                           |
| Documents Reviewed  | 22 documents reviewed            |
| Scored              | 2026-04-02                       |

## Red Flags

- Large discrepancy between verified ER figures across documents (171,708 vs 916,543) indicates a high risk of misunderstanding or misreporting of credited volumes.
- Numerous corrective actions cite inconsistencies in metering records, rounding that is not conservative, and template/period mismatches in the monitoring report.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

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

- Leakage is treated as 0% but is inconsistently justified across monitoring records, and the 2022 cycle raised multiple MRV/calc issues (monitoring report, 2022-09-01).

The project applies ACM0002 (v20.0) and the extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports additionality robustness. Baseline setting is project-specific, with a baseline reassessment noted for 2021 and a grid emission factor reported as 0.4929 (monitoring report, 2022-09-01). Integrity is weakened by the 2022 monitoring/verification cycle flagging inconsistencies between reported monthly export/import and underlying records, and non-conservative rounding of emissions (monitoring report, 2022-09-01). Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction, but the justification is inconsistent across monitoring records, which reduces confidence in the completeness of leakage treatment.

### Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are disclosed (methodology ACM0002 v20.0, monitoring period 2019-12-02—2021-12-31, VVB named as 4K Earth Science Private Limited).

- The 2022 monitoring/verification record lists many required corrections and internal inconsistencies, reducing confidence in reported data quality (monitoring report, 2022-09-01).

The extracted record provides clear identifiers (VCS-762, VCS registry), the VVB name (4K Earth Science Private Limited), the monitoring period (2019-12-02—2021-12-31), and key calculation inputs like the grid emission factor and its year (monitoring report, 2022-09-01). Transparency is reduced because the same monitoring/verification package lists many items requiring correction (meter change disclosure, missing parameter purpose/calculation method, and multiple template/period inconsistencies), indicating that the public-facing MRV narrative and spreadsheets were not internally consistent at submission time (monitoring report, 2022-09-01). The large mismatch between claimed and verified ER figures across documents further undermines interpretability for external reviewers.

### Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim double-claiming risk (registry extract).

- Baseline and ER-related parameters show inconsistencies across documents (grid emission factor and ER totals), increasing over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of aviation-related double claiming in marketing (registry extract). Claim safety is nonetheless constrained by over-crediting risk signals: the grid emission factor differs between older validation documentation (0.5596; validation report, 2012-01-13) and the later monitoring report value (0.4929; monitoring report, 2022-09-01), and ER totals are inconsistent across validation/verification records. In addition, the 2022 corrective actions include non-conservative rounding and inconsistencies in electricity records, both of which can directly affect credited emission reductions (monitoring report, 2022-09-01).

## Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 15 documents used.

- The monitoring/verification package required extensive corrective actions, suggesting documentation quality/control weaknesses (monitoring report, 2022-09-01).

The extracted record indicates a reasonably broad evidence base (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 15 documents used and high extraction confidence, supporting a mid-to-strong documentation score. However, the 2022 monitoring report/verification process required extensive corrective actions, including requests for track-changed PDD updates, clarification of declining estimated CERs versus the registered PDD, and missing meter chronology/calibration details (monitoring report, 2022-09-01). These issues suggest documentation control and versioning discipline problems even if documents exist.

## Risk Indicators

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| ● <b>Additionality</b> | VVB-confirmed investment test                             |
| ● <b>Permanence</b>    | Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated             |
| ● <b>Leakage</b>       | 0% leakage with inconsistent justification                |
| ● <b>Baseline</b>      | Project-specific baseline; parameter inconsistencies      |
| ● <b>Safeguards</b>    | Safeguards/grievance mentioned but inconsistent over time |
| ● <b>Double-claim</b>  | Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated                |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled ER calculation package that clearly explains the 916,543 vs 171,708 discrepancy (scope, periods, issuance vs verification) and provides consistent spreadsheets tied to meter records.

→ Provide a consolidated safeguards file (FPIC approach, stakeholder engagement evidence, grievance log/process, benefit-sharing details) and ensure consistent inclusion across monitoring periods and templates.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- 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-8247D551 · 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)