

QUALITY REPORT

Bugoye 13.0 MW Run-of-River Hydropower Project

VCS-1199 · VCS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-5051AB91 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS run-of-river hydropower project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported, which supports moderate integrity. However, leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, meter calibration and shutdown details were requested for clarification, and there are several document-level contradictions that reduce confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1199
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS Type I – Renewable Energy Project and Category I.D.- Grid connected renewable electricity generation 15
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	281,345 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while an earlier validation report treated leakage as negligible.
- The verification record shows a large jump in verified and claimed emissions reductions from 51,177 to 281,345, which needs careful explanation.
- The monitoring report requested clarification on meter calibration and missing hourly shutdown and single-line diagram details.
- FPIC was not conducted, and the grievance mechanism and safeguards appear inconsistently documented across reports.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the validation report.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and the project is a grid-connected hydropower activity where leakage should be explicitly discussed.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test, which is stronger than the barrier test mentioned in the PDD, so I privileged the validation report because it is the later and more specific VVB-checked source. No material findings were reported, but leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and the project is a run-of-river hydropower activity where baseline and leakage treatment should be clearly documented. The absence of a buffer pool value and any reversal evidence leaves permanence only moderately supported.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The project has multiple official documents in the record, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials.

- The monitoring report requested clarification on meter calibration, hourly shutdown details, and the single-line diagram, indicating gaps in MRV completeness.

The record includes a validation report, monitoring report, PDD, and issuance material, which helps transparency, and the VVB is named as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification). However, the monitoring report requested clarification on meter calibration, hourly shutdown details, and the single-line diagram, which suggests incomplete MRV disclosure. The total emissions reductions verified and claimed are both 281,345 in the later validation record, but the supporting detail behind that figure is not fully transparent in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of dual-claim risk.

- The verified and claimed emissions reductions are 281,345, but earlier validation material cited 51,177, creating a material inconsistency in the credited volume.

Claim safety is weakened by the large discrepancy between the earlier 51,177 figure and the later 281,345 verified and claimed amount; I privileged the 2021 validation report because it is the more recent verification source, but the jump still raises over-crediting concerns. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but CCP status is not stated. Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, with the earlier validation calling it negligible and the monitoring report saying it was not addressed.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

+ The extraction confidence is high and 17 documents were used, which supports a reasonably strong documentary base.

- The monitoring report still contains unresolved clarification requests, and the crediting period differs from the earlier PDD period, showing document evolution and some inconsistency.

Documentation is fairly broad, with 17 documents used and high extraction confidence, which supports a mid-range score. Still, the monitoring report contains explicit requests for clarification on project naming, meter calibration, and shutdown data, showing that the documentary record is not fully clean. The later monitoring period also differs from the earlier PDD crediting period, which is not inherently problematic but does show that the project record evolved over time.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed in monitoring
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	Partial safeguards with no FPIC
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear reconciliation of the 51,177 versus 281,345 emissions reduction figures, with a traceable explanation from the underlying monitoring and verification records.

→ Publish complete MRV evidence for meter calibration, shutdown logs, and the single-line diagram, and explicitly document leakage treatment and any buffer or reversal safeguards.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- 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-5051AB91 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy