QUALITY REPORT

18 MW Kemphole Mini Hydel Scheme (KMHS), by International Power Corporation Limited, India

VCS-1893 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-61ADF5B1 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	5.4
Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS hydropower project with VVB-verified additionality and no reported reversal events, which supports moderate integrity. However, the file set shows several documentation and methodology issues, including unresolved leakage treatment, multiple corrective actions, and contradictions across documents that reduce confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1893
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2024
VVB	4K EARTH SCIENCE PRIVATE LIMITED
Verified ERs	112,482 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	16 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the monitoring report, despite an earlier document indicating it was quantified.
- The monitoring report lists many corrective actions, including unclear monitoring periods, missing calibration evidence, and methodology/boundary issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test, and the VVB is named as 4K EARTH SCIENCE PRIVATE LIMITED.

- Leakage justification is recorded as not addressed in the monitoring report, and the project file includes numerous corrective actions on methodology, boundary, and monitoring controls.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the verification report confirms additionality through an investment test, and the monitoring record shows no reversal events. At the same time, the baseline is project-specific and the monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, which weakens robustness for a hydropower project. The many corrective actions, including methodology, boundary, and calibration issues, further reduce confidence in the underlying MRV quality.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring period and crediting period are stated, and claimed and verified emission reductions are identical at 112,482 tCO2e.

- The monitoring report requests resubmission of revised documents, clearer period boundaries, invoices, calibration certificates, and a current monitoring report, indicating incomplete public documentation.

Transparency is only moderate because the monitoring period, crediting period, and exact claimed versus verified issuance are available, with both totals reported as 112,482. However, the monitoring report asks for resubmission of revised documents, a clearer monitoring-period definition, invoices, calibration certificates, and a current monitoring report, all of which point to incomplete disclosure. The extraction record also shows a contradiction on the crediting period across monitoring documents, which lowers reliability.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized baseline, and leakage treatment is weakly supported in the available record.

Claim safety is middling: the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of overlapping international claims, but the CCP status is not stated. The baseline remains project-specific, and the leakage treatment is weak because one document says leakage was quantified while the monitoring report says it was not addressed. Because the claimed and verified issuance match exactly, over-crediting is not obvious from the extracted figures, but the documentation issues keep the risk above average.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were available, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material.

- The monitoring report contains many corrective actions and the extraction record notes a contradiction on the crediting period between monitoring documents.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. There are several official documents in the record and extraction confidence is high, yet the monitoring report lists many corrective actions and requests for missing supporting evidence. The contradiction on the crediting period between monitoring documents also suggests that the file set is not fully clean or internally consistent.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project with no reversals reported
Leakage	Leakage not addressed in latest monitoring record
Baseline	Project-specific baseline
Safeguards	Grievance mechanism noted, but FPIC disputed
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clean, reconciled document set that resolves the contradictions on FPIC, benefit sharing, leakage treatment, and the crediting period.

→ Submit complete monitoring evidence, including calibrated meter records, invoices, a clear monitoring report, and a documented leakage assessment aligned with the methodology.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report

Report ID: CM-61ADF5B1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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