

QUALITY REPORT

Ishasha 6.6 MW Small Hydropower Project

VCS-1286 · VCS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-919A3EE0 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS hydropower project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported reversals, but the evidence base is weakened by missing leakage justification, no buffer pool information, and several monitoring/reporting gaps. The project also shows important document inconsistencies, including conflicting crediting period and emissions reduction figures, which reduce confidence in the claimed results.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1286
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0008 17
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+)
Verified ERs	8,514 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	25 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- Leakage is shown as zero, but the justification is not addressed in the available record.
- The documents conflict on credited emissions reductions and the crediting period, indicating reliability issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test, and no reversal events were reported in the issuance record.
- Leakage treatment is weak: the record shows a zero leakage deduction but says leakage justification was not addressed, and no buffer pool is stated.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the VVB confirmed additionality through a barrier test, and the issuance record reports no reversal events. However, the baseline is project-specific, leakage is marked as not addressed even though a zero deduction was applied, and no buffer pool is stated, which weakens permanence and leakage robustness. The corrective actions also show unresolved monitoring and calibration issues, including missing downtime details and incomplete meter calibration coverage.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

- + The monitoring period and VVB identity are stated, and the issuance record reports equal claimed and verified emissions reductions for the period used.
- Several monitoring details are missing or incomplete, including the usage monitoring method, and the corrective actions list points to missing downtime, calibration, and ex-ante parameter disclosures.

Transparency is only moderate because the VVB name, monitoring period, and verified emissions reductions are stated in the issuance record. At the same time, the usage monitoring method is not found in the extracted record, and the corrective actions indicate missing operational detail, including downtime, calibration dates, and some ex-ante parameters. The medium extraction confidence helps, but it does not offset the number of disclosure gaps.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

- + The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, leakage is not well justified, and the record contains a major contradiction on emissions reductions versus an earlier document.

Claim safety is constrained by the project-specific baseline, the weak leakage explanation, and the absence of a clear usage monitoring record. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-claim risk, but the record also contains a contradiction on emissions reductions: one document shows 8,514 tCO₂e while an earlier document shows 23,537 tCO₂e. I privileged the later issuance record for the reported verified amount because it is the most recent and appears to be the final issuance source, but the discrepancy still lowers confidence materially.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

- + A relatively large set of documents was used, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- The issuance record includes many corrective actions, and the crediting period in the monitoring report does not match the period in the earlier project documents.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong: 25 documents were used and extraction confidence is medium, which is better than a low-confidence file set. Still, the issuance record lists many corrective actions, and the crediting period in the monitoring report does not align with the earlier project crediting period stated in the contradictions list. The absence of several safeguard and operational details also suggests incomplete documentation coverage.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	No reversals reported; no buffer stated
● Leakage	Zero deduction but justification not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline; reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	No FPIC or grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, reconciled monitoring package that explains the emissions reduction discrepancy, crediting-period inconsistency, and all meter calibration and downtime gaps.

→ Document leakage justification, safeguard procedures, grievance handling, and any buffer or reversal management approach in a single consistent set of project records.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Deed - Uganda Ishasha.pdf
- ISS5_1286_02NOV2021.pdf
- CQC - Eco Power - Ishasha - VCU Deed of Representatio -signed.pdf
- Uganda Issuance Deed of Representation - July 2020.pdf
- Deed of Rep - CQC and EPHL - 31-Oct-2018.pdf
- Ishasha VCS 1286 -MR ver 01.1_12.6.2020.pdf
- Ishasha VCS MR ver 2 18Aug14 Clean.pdf
- VCS 1286-MR-May2020-Mar2021-27.10.2021-version 2.1.pdf
- Ishasha VCS MR ver 2.1 290916 clean.pdf
- Ishasha VCS MR ver 2_170818_clean.pdf
- Communication Agreement - C-Quest.pdf
- Representation Deed - Uganda Ishasha.pdf
- Ishasha - CDM PDD (uploaded 26 Jul 12 10-00-58).pdf
- Ishasha VCS PD ver 1 28Feb14.pdf
- VCS Verification Representation_Ishasha Copy.pdf
- FVR_VCS_VER_VCS ID 1286_Ishasha_29.10.2021.pdf
- VCS Ver Representation Ishasha - 2017.pdf
- Ishasha - CDM Validation Rep (uploaded 26 Jul 12 10-00-57).pdf
- 1286_VCR_AG - 2017.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v4.1.pdf
- VCS Validation Representation_Ishasha Copy.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Report-Ishasha VCS 1286.pdf
- VCS Verification Representation_Ishasha Hydro.pdf
- VCS Verification Report_ISHASHA_final_pst TR2 Copy.pdf
- VCS Verification Report_Ishasha Hydro_ver2.pdf

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-919A3EE0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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