

QUALITY REPORT

Bujagali Hydropower Project

VCS-1505 · VCS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-8352E619 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	3.3

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, the baseline method is stated, and no material findings were reported. However, the record shows several data-quality issues, including multiple corrective actions, low extraction confidence, and a sizable gap between claimed and verified emissions reductions. Overall, this is a moderately weak file with meaningful reliability and claim-safety concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1505
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12
Crediting Period	2011 — 2018
VVB	TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd
Verified ERs	1,399,403 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2013
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- Verified emissions reductions are materially lower than claimed, indicating a substantial over-claim risk.
- The verification record lists several corrective actions, including inconsistencies in generation data and missing operational details.
- Safeguards and community-process documentation are weak or contradicted across documents.
- Leakage is treated as negligible, but the supporting justification is thin and one document version said it was not addressed.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a stated project baseline under ACM0002.
- The verification report required multiple corrective actions, including inconsistent generation evidence and missing operational details; reversal risk is not addressed and no buffer pool is stated.

The VVB confirmed additionality using a barrier test, and the project has a stated project baseline under ACM0002, which supports the core accounting framework. That said, the verification report lists several corrective actions, including inconsistent generation evidence and missing operational details, and reversal events are not addressed; no buffer pool is stated. Leakage is treated as negligible, but the support is limited, so the overall integrity picture is only moderate.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

- + The monitoring period, crediting period, VVB name, and both claimed and verified emission reductions are available in the issuance record.
- Low extraction confidence and only one usable evidence document reduce confidence in the completeness and readability of the file.

The issuance record provides the monitoring period, crediting period, VVB name, and both claimed and verified emission reductions, which helps traceability. However, the extracted record shows low extraction confidence, and the evidence list includes an unknown document, which weakens confidence in completeness. The gap between claimed and verified reductions is also a transparency concern because it suggests the public-facing claim may not match the verified outcome.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.
- Verified reductions are far below claimed reductions, and the leakage treatment relies on a negligible-justification statement rather than a quantified deduction rationale.

Claim safety is weakened by the large difference between claimed reductions and verified reductions, which raises over-crediting risk. The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-channel claim concerns, but the registry status alone does not eliminate broader market-claim risk. Leakage is described as negligible, yet the record does not provide a strong quantified justification beyond that statement.

Documentation — 3.3 / 10

- + Thirteen documents were used, and the issuance record includes the monitoring and crediting periods plus the VVB identity.
- The extracted record shows low readability, one evidence document is listed as unknown, and several corrective actions indicate documentation gaps.

Documentation is mixed: thirteen documents were used, and the record includes the key dates and VVB identity. But the extraction confidence is low, one evidence document is not identified, and the verification report required several corrective actions. Those issues suggest the file is usable but not especially robust or cleanly documented.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	0% deduction with limited justification
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, 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 clean, fully readable verification package that reconciles all generation data and explains every corrective action.

→ Publish explicit safeguards documentation, including FPIC, grievance handling, and any community or benefit-sharing arrangements, plus a clearer leakage rationale.

Documents Reviewed

- OTHER__1505_12NOV2015_CDM4217CONV_DEED.pdf
- MONIT_REP_1505_01DEC2011_to_31OCT2013_CDM4217.pdf
- MONIT_REP_4217_01DEC2011_to_31OCT2013_CDM.pdf
- PP_REG_REP_1505_07OCT2011_CDM4217.pdf
- OTHER_1505_14NOV2015_CDM CANCEL.pdf
- PP_REG_REP_4217_07OCT2011_CDM.pdf
- OTHER_14NOV2015_accountStatement.pdf
- PROJ_DESC_1505_08MARCH2014_CDM4217.pdf
- VALID_REP_1505_06OCT2011_CDM4217.pdf
- VALID_STA_1505_28MAY2014_CDM4217.pdf
- VERIF_REP_4217_01DEC2011_to_31OCT2013_CDM.pdf
- VALID_STA_4217_28MAY2014_CDM.pdf
- VALID_REP_4217_06OCT2011_CDM.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-8352E619 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy