

QUALITY REPORT

Aslancik Hydro Power Plant Project

VCS-917 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-F87E27AE · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected hydro renewable energy project under VCS with additionality presented as an investment test and a quantified grid emission factor, but several cross-document inconsistencies reduce confidence in the emissions reduction numbers and non-carbon safeguards narrative. The monitoring record shows a sizable gap between claimed and verified reductions and a large number of corrective actions, which increases over-crediting and MRV risk despite generally good document availability.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-917
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	2014, 2017
Project Methodology	ACM0002 22
Crediting Period	2024 — 2034
VVB	Applus
Verified ERs	300,527 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	26 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Major inconsistencies in emissions reduction figures across documents (e.g., 329,859 vs 827,828) and in the verified total (300,527 vs 827,828), undermining confidence in credit quantities.
- Large number of corrective action requests (CAR-1 through CAR-18 and CAR-22) indicates material MRV/process weaknesses during assessment.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports (quantified vs not addressed) while a 0% leakage deduction is applied.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The monitoring/assessment record states additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not stated; combined with multiple contradictions, this increases over-crediting risk.

The monitoring/assessment record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and framed as an investment test, which supports additionality for a renewable energy project. However, the baseline is described as project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens baseline robustness. Leakage is applied as a 0% deduction, but the monitoring record is inconsistent on whether leakage was quantified or not addressed, reducing confidence in the completeness of the accounting. No reversal buffer is stated (and reversals are not relevant for an avoidance hydro project), but the large number of corrective actions signals process weaknesses that can affect integrity.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + Key MRV elements are disclosed (methodology ACM0002 v22, grid emission factor 0.533, monitoring period 2022-05-01 to 2024-03-07, VVB named as Applus).
- Claimed vs verified reductions differ materially (329,859 claimed vs 300,527 verified) and ERR figures conflict across documents.

The monitoring report (dated 2025-03-28) provides a clear monitoring period (2022-05-01 to 2024-03-07), identifies the VVB (Applus), and reports a grid emission factor of 0.533 under ACM0002 version 22. Transparency is reduced by the material gap between claimed and verified reductions in the extracted record (329,859 claimed vs 300,527 verified), indicating adjustments and potential MRV issues. Multiple contradictions across documents on key quantities (ERR totals, leakage justification, crediting period) further reduce the reliability of what is publicly reported.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream double-claiming/eligibility risks.
- Contradictory ERR totals and inconsistent leakage justification increase the risk of over-crediting and weak defensibility of claims.

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain eligibility-based marketing claims. Nonetheless, the emissions reduction numbers are inconsistent across documents, including very large discrepancies involving 827,828 versus the monitoring-period figures, which increases greenwashing/over-crediting risk if buyers rely on headline totals. Leakage justification is inconsistent across monitoring reports while applying a 0% deduction, which weakens defensibility of claims even if leakage is typically low for grid-connected renewables. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity label claims.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (19 documents including PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Numerous corrective actions (CAR-1 to CAR-18 and CAR-22) suggest documentation/MRV quality issues despite availability.

Documentation coverage appears relatively strong in breadth (19 documents including PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, suggesting the underlying files were readable. However, the presence of many corrective action requests (CAR-1 through CAR-18 and CAR-22) indicates that, despite document availability, the quality/completeness of evidence and MRV procedures required substantial remediation. Several social/safeguards items (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, safeguards mention) are contradictory across documents, suggesting inconsistent reporting rather than consistently documented safeguards.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; reversal risk low
● Leakage	0% deduction with inconsistent justification
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reporting inconsistent
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled ERR table that clearly separates ex-ante estimates from ex-post verified reductions for each monitoring period, and align all documents/registry entries to the same totals.

→ Provide a consistent leakage assessment narrative (even if negligible) with explicit justification under ACM0002 and ensure it matches the applied 0% deduction.

→ Resolve safeguards inconsistencies by publishing dated evidence of FPIC, grievance mechanism operation, and benefit-sharing arrangements, and ensure validation/monitoring reports reference the same evidence set.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- 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-F87E27AE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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