QUALITY REPORT

BATICIM BATI ANADOLU CIMENTO SANAYII A.S. 9 MW Cement WHR Project

VCS-822 · VCS · Turkey

Report ID: CM-1F7671A1 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10		
	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS waste-heat recovery project with VVB-confirmed investment-test additionality and no material findings reported in the monitoring record. However, key crediting and leakage details are incomplete or inconsistent across documents, which weakens confidence in the claimed emission reductions and overall claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-822
Sector	other
Country	Turkey
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0012 04.0.0
Crediting Period	2013 — 2023
VVB	Rina
Verified ERs	148,337 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while the validation report said it was deemed negligible.
- The project is marked not CORSIA-eligible, but no CCP status is stated, leaving some registry/claim context incomplete.
- The monitoring report does not state a leakage deduction percentage or any verified usage monitoring method.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring record.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and no leakage deduction is stated.

The monitoring report shows an investment-test additionality assessment and says the VVB confirmed it, which supports the project's core eligibility case. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, but the absence of a stated leakage deduction and the lack of reversal information leave permanence and leakage management only partially evidenced. The baseline is project-based, which is acceptable but less robust than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed baseline.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, Rina, and the monitoring period is clearly stated in the 2023 monitoring report.

- The report does not state total claimed emissions, usage monitoring method, or a verified usage rate.

The documentation identifies the VVB and provides a clear monitoring period, which helps traceability. However, the record does not state total claimed emissions, a verified usage rate, or the usage monitoring method, so the MRV trail is incomplete. The project is also marked not CORSIA-eligible, which is useful, but CCP status is not stated.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly marked not CORSIA-eligible, reducing one channel of claim risk.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed jurisdictional baseline, and leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is not CORSIA-eligible and there is no evidence of double registration in the extracted record. That said, leakage handling is inconsistent: the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while the validation report said it was deemed negligible, so I privileged the more recent monitoring report for operational treatment but noted the earlier validation view as a contradiction. The project-specific baseline and missing usage data also leave some over-crediting risk unresolved.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence.

- The record still lacks several key quantified fields, including buffer pool coverage, leakage deduction, and usage monitoring details.

The record draws on multiple official documents, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and extraction confidence is high. Still, several important fields are missing or unstated, including buffer pool coverage, leakage deduction, and usage monitoring details. The crediting period in the monitoring report also differs from the validation report, which suggests the documentation trail is not fully consistent even though the newer monitoring report was prioritized for the current period.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	Partial safeguards evidence
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and reconcile the monitoring and validation statements on whether leakage is negligible or not addressed.

→ Disclose the usage monitoring method, verified usage rate, and any buffer pool or reversal-management information to strengthen MRV and permanence confidence.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-1F7671A1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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