

QUALITY REPORT

9 MW Neria Hydroelectric Project, Karnataka, India

VCS-132 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-B11571D9 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
■ Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered hydropower avoidance project with VVB-confirmed additionality, but the evidence base has meaningful gaps around leakage, baseline reassessment, and permanence. The monitoring report also shows several corrective actions and some document inconsistencies, which reduce confidence in the claimed reductions and safeguards.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-132
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. 10.0
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	84,642 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated.
- The monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including clarification of monitoring dates, double-accounting checks, and missing stakeholder consultation records.
- There are contradictions in reported emissions reductions, crediting period dates, and grid emission factor values across documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the validation/verification record.
- Leakage treatment is not stated and the monitoring report says leakage is not addressed; buffer pool coverage is also not found in the extracted record.

The project's additionality case is stronger than average because the validation record shows an investment test and VVB confirmation. However, leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, no leakage deduction is stated, and no buffer pool information was found, which weakens permanence and net-benefit confidence for a hydropower avoidance project.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period in the monitoring report.
- Key MRV details are missing, including the usage monitoring method, verified usage rate, and a clear leakage deduction; the monitoring report also lists several corrective actions.

Transparency is mixed: the project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period in the monitoring report, but key MRV fields are missing or not quantified, including the usage monitoring method and verified usage rate. The monitoring report also lists multiple corrective actions, suggesting the documentation trail is incomplete even though the extraction confidence is high.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

- + The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of market-claim overlap risk.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and the emissions reduction figures conflict across documents.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-market claim risk. That said, the baseline is project-specific, leakage is not addressed, and the reported emissions reductions differ across documents, so over-crediting risk cannot be dismissed.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and extraction confidence is high.
- The monitoring report requires several clarifications and missing supporting records, and the crediting period differs between the monitoring report and the PDD.

Documentation breadth is decent because the extracted record includes validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and the extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report contains several corrective actions and the crediting period conflicts with the PDD, so the record is not fully clean or internally consistent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No buffer pool found
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	Partial safeguards evidence
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a quantified leakage assessment and, if applicable, a justified leakage deduction or explicit rationale for negligible leakage.

→ Resolve the document inconsistencies by reconciling emissions reduction totals, crediting period dates, and grid emission factor values, and publish the missing monitoring and stakeholder records.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- 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-B11571D9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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