

QUALITY REPORT

Ceyhan 61.7 MW Hydropower Project

VCS-810 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-1A5C080F · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	7.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has a clear VCS renewable-energy methodology (ACM0002) and the monitoring report reports no material findings, with claimed and verified reductions matching in the extracted record. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (ERR totals, grid emission factor, crediting period, and safeguards/additionality statements) and weak leakage treatment reduce confidence in the robustness of the credited outcome.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-810
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.1.0
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. ■ti.
Verified ERs	681,250 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	29 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large inconsistencies in reported/verified emission reductions across documents (e.g., 681,250 vs ~272,388–287,566).
- Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction while leakage is also described as either “quantified” or “not addressed,” creating MRV ambiguity.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality is described as an investment test and is stated as confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring report (2022).
- Baseline is project-specific and key parameters show inconsistencies across documents (grid emission factor and crediting period), undermining baseline reliability.

The monitoring report (2022) indicates additionality was assessed using an investment test and states it was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality. Baseline setting is project-specific under ACM0002, but baseline credibility is weakened by conflicting grid emission factor values between the monitoring report (2022) and a later validation report (2022). Leakage treatment is also weak: the monitoring report (2022) shows a 0% leakage deduction while leakage is recorded as not addressed, which is not robust for integrity.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

- + Monitoring period is clearly stated (2018-06-01 to 2020-05-31) and the monitoring report (2022) reports no material findings.
- Core quantitative results vary widely across validation/monitoring documents (ERR totals and grid emission factor), reducing transparency and traceability.

The monitoring report (2022) clearly defines the monitoring period (2018-06-01 to 2020-05-31) and reports no material findings. However, transparency is reduced by major inconsistencies in reported emission reductions across documents, including different totals in validation reports (2012 and 2022) versus the monitoring report (2022). The grid emission factor discrepancy (monitoring report 2022 vs validation report 2022) further reduces traceability of calculations.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, lowering aviation-claim exposure.
- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory ERR totals and conflicting grid emission factor values across documents.

The extracted record states the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation-related claims. Nonetheless, claim safety is constrained by over-crediting uncertainty: the verified ER figure differs materially across documents (monitoring report 2022 vs validation report 2022), and the grid emission factor differs between monitoring and validation documents in 2022. Leakage is also inconsistently treated (0% deduction with conflicting narrative), which increases greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 7.0 / 10

- + A relatively large document set was used (19 records including PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) with high extraction confidence.
- Corrective actions in the monitoring report (2022) indicate missing key supporting evidence (EIA certificate and stakeholder meeting records).

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the evidence set includes PDD, validation, monitoring, and issuance records, and extraction confidence is high. However, the monitoring report (2022) lists corrective actions requiring provision of an “EIA Not Required Certificate” and stakeholder meeting records, indicating gaps in supporting evidence. These missing items reduce confidence that safeguards and permitting/stakeholder processes are fully evidenced in the accessible record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test stated; cross-document inconsistency on VVB confirmation
● Permanence	Avoidance renewable-energy project; no reversal events indicated
● Leakage	0% deduction with inconsistent/unclear leakage justification
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline with conflicting grid EF and unclear reassessment
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance reported in monitoring but contradicted by older validation
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation table across validation/monitoring documents explaining why ER totals differ (272,388/287,566 vs 681,250) and which figures correspond to which periods and issuance events.

→ Provide complete supporting evidence for corrective actions (EIA certificate and stakeholder meeting records) and standardize leakage and baseline parameter statements (including a single authoritative grid emission factor and crediting period).

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification 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-1A5C080F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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