

QUALITY REPORT

Allain Duhangan Hydroelectric Project (ADHP)

VCS-2026 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-09FCD77E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project shows solid third-party verification alignment for the reported monitoring period, with claimed and verified emission reductions matching and no material findings or corrective actions reported. However, key integrity elements (baseline approach, reassessment timing, and leakage treatment) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2026
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2019
Project Methodology	ACM0002 06
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	1,535,217 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and timing of any baseline reassessment are not stated in the extracted record, despite use of ACM0002.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed and no leakage deduction is provided, creating an integrity gap for a renewable energy project assessment.
- Crediting period start date differs between the monitoring report and validation report, indicating document inconsistency.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2020-06-20) shows claimed and verified ERs are identical (1,535,217) and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline method and baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage is not addressed with no stated deduction.

Additionality is indicated as confirmed by the VVB, supporting the project's additionality case, but the specific additionality test type is not stated in the extracted record (validation/monitoring documentation referenced). The monitoring report (2020-06-20) reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports procedural integrity for the monitored period. However, the baseline method and the date of any baseline reassessment are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage is marked as not addressed with no stated leakage deduction, which weakens confidence in the baseline and net ER robustness under ACM0002.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period (2016-10-01 to 2019-09-30) and identifies the VVB (Applus+).

- Several MRV-relevant fields are missing in the extracted record (baseline method, leakage deduction, CORSIA/CCP status), limiting completeness for external reviewers.

The monitoring report (2020-06-20) clearly states the monitoring period (2016-10-01 to 2019-09-30) and identifies the VVB as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification). The record also provides a grid emission factor value (0.737), which helps interpret calculations at a high level. Transparency is reduced because key contextual items are not stated in the extracted record (baseline method, leakage deduction, and CORSIA/CCP status), limiting independent replication and claims interpretation.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ Verified ERs match claimed ERs in the monitoring report (2020-06-20), reducing immediate overstatement risk for that issuance batch.

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage/baseline details are insufficiently evidenced, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

For the reported period, the monitoring report (2020-06-20) shows claimed ERs equal verified ERs (1,535,217), which lowers the risk of simple over-issuance for that verification event. Nonetheless, leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record, and baseline details are not evidenced, which increases over-crediting risk in public claims. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess whether the credits might be marketed into multiple integrity frameworks without further due diligence.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Multiple document types are referenced (monitoring report, validation report, PDD) with high extraction confidence and 6 documents used.

- An internal inconsistency exists on the crediting period start date between the monitoring report and validation report.

The extracted record references multiple core documents (monitoring report, validation report, and PDD) and indicates high extraction confidence, supporting document completeness and readability. The monitoring report is dated 2020-06-20 and covers a defined monitoring period, suggesting reasonably current MRV for that issuance cycle. Documentation quality is weakened by an inconsistency between documents on the crediting period start date, which signals a need for clearer registry-aligned project metadata.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality (test type not specified)
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed; no deduction stated
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced in extracted record
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Disclose and clearly cite the baseline approach used under ACM0002 (including any baseline reassessment timing and parameters) in publicly available documentation/registry fields.
- Provide an explicit leakage assessment (and deduction if applicable) or a documented justification for negligible leakage consistent with the methodology.
- Resolve and harmonize the crediting period start date across the monitoring report, validation report, and registry listing with an explicit explanation.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- 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-09FCD77E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy