QUALITY REPORT

Dagachhu Hydropower Project, Bhutan

CNN-b710d5 · Gold Standard · Bhutan

Report ID: CM-FBFC2676 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

7.3 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.8
Transparency (25%)	8.4
Claim Safety (25%)	6.1
Documentation (15%)	8.8

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registry-grade project with a public Gold Standard/CDM registry record, PDD, validation report, and multiple monitoring reports. Evidence is strong on documentation and transparency, but claim safety is moderated by the project's age and the fact that the core additionality case relies on a 2010-era financial/barrier analysis for a hydropower project in a policy-supported sector.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-b710d5
Country	Bhutan
Vintage	2013
Project Methodology	ACM0002 7
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
VVB	Det Norske Veritas
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-08

Red Flags

- Legacy CDM-era hydropower additionality case relies on older financial/barrier arguments rather than a recent revalidation.
- No evidence of Article 6 authorization or corresponding adjustment for buyer claims.
- Monitoring/verification evidence provided is historical rather than recent (<2 years).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ DNV validation found the project additional using financial and barrier analysis [Validation Report, 2010]

~ ACM0002 baseline and ex-post combined margin updates support baseline rigor, but the case is dated [Validation Report]

The validation report by DNV states that the project is additional, citing financial barrier evidence, CDM revenue dependence, and the absence of main construction at the time of validation. It also documents a conservative methodology choice under ACM0002 and ex-post updating of the combined margin grid emission factor, which helps baseline credibility. However, this is a grid-connected hydropower project in Bhutan/India, so additionality remains somewhat mixed because the case is based on older CDM-era arguments rather than a modern, independently re-tested investment test.

Transparency — 8.4 / 10

+ Public registry record includes PDD, validation report, monitoring reports, issuance history, and participant changes

+ Multiple monitoring reports and serial ranges are publicly listed on the registry

The official registry page provides the PDD, validation report, validation opinion on PDD changes, registration history, crediting periods, and multiple monitoring reports with issuance records. The project documents are publicly accessible and the registry metadata is unusually complete, including participant changes and serial ranges. The main gap is that the most recent monitoring documents shown are historical, so transparency is high but not fully current.

Claim Safety — 6.1 / 10

- No evidence of CCP approval, Article 6 authorization, or corresponding adjustment

~ Legacy CDM vintages and old issuance periods increase buyer claim risk

The project is not presented as CCP-approved, and there is no evidence of Article 6 authorization or corresponding adjustment, so buyer claims should be limited to voluntary climate contribution rather than offsetting with host-country adjustment. Vintage risk is moderate because the project’s crediting periods and issuance history are old, even though the registry record is clear. Double-counting risk is reduced by the registry trail and participant authorizations, but claim safety is still below top tier because the credits are legacy CDM-era avoidance units.

Documentation — 8.8 / 10

+ Public PDD and DNV validation report are available [PDD, Validation Report]

+ Multiple monitoring reports are public, but the latest shown are historical rather than recent

The registry includes a public PDD, a third-party validation report from DNV, and multiple monitoring reports for 2014-2019 with issuance requests marked issued. The validation report is detailed and cites the underlying feasibility study, approvals, and monitoring approach. What is missing from the provided record is a recent verification/monitoring cycle within the last two years, so the documentation is strong but dated.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	documented evidence
Permanence	low reversal risk for run-of-river hydropower
Leakage	no material leakage issue evidenced
Baseline	baseline methodology is approved, but grid factors are histo
Safeguards	public approvals and validation documented
Double-claim	registry trail is clear, but no corresponding adjustment evi

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a recent verification or monitoring update covering the latest operating period and grid emission factor recalculation.

→ Provide explicit buyer-claim guidance on the registry page, including whether any host-country authorization or corresponding adjustment exists.

→ Disclose a current lifecycle/financial reassessment showing whether the project would still be additional under today's Bhutan/India power-market conditions.

Documents Reviewed

- approval
- 01 Jan 2016 - 31 Dec 2016
- 01 Jan 2018 - 31 Dec 2018
- 01 Jan 2017 - 31 Dec 2017
- 01 Apr 2014 - 31 Dec 2015
- 01 Jan 2020 - 31 Dec 2020
- 01 Jan 2019 - 31 Dec 2019
- registration request form
- 01 Jan 2021 - 31 Mar 2021
- project design document
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- 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-FBFC2676 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-08 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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