

QUALITY REPORT

3.5 MW Small Hydro Project In Himachal Pradesh

VCS-2033 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-C64E4ED8 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
■ Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS small hydro project with VVB-verified additionality and no reported reversal events, but the leakage treatment is weak because the monitoring record says leakage was not addressed. The project has some safeguards documentation, yet the monitoring report also lists several missing supporting documents and corrective actions, which reduces confidence in the claimed emissions reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2033
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 18.0.1
Crediting Period	2018 — 2028
VVB	LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	8,652 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage was marked as not addressed in the monitoring report, despite the PDD previously describing it as negligible.
- The verified emissions figure is inconsistent across validation documents, with 8,652 tCO₂e ultimately verified versus an earlier 19,788 tCO₂e figure.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Leakage justification is not addressed in the monitoring report, and no leakage deduction is stated.

The project has a positive integrity signal because additionality was confirmed by the VVB through an investment test, and no reversal events are reported in the extracted record. However, the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, and no leakage deduction is stated, which weakens the robustness of the crediting case. The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed baseline, so the overall integrity case is only moderate.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

- + The monitoring report and validation report provide a quantified verified emissions figure of 8,652 tCO₂e for the monitoring period.
- The monitoring report lists multiple missing supporting documents, including calibration certificates and invoices, which weakens MRV transparency.

Transparency is mixed: the monitoring period and verified emissions are stated, and the VVB is identified as LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification). At the same time, the monitoring report lists several missing supporting documents, including calibration certificates, invoices, and technical equipment details, and it notes inconsistencies in the MR template and date format. That reduces confidence in the completeness of the public MRV trail.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

- + The project is a renewable small hydro activity under VCS with a VVB-verified monitoring claim.
- The monitoring report does not address leakage, and the verified emissions figure changed materially from an earlier validation figure.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is a renewable small hydro activity and the verified emissions claim is supported by a VVB. Still, the monitoring report leaves leakage unaddressed, and the record contains a major discrepancy in verified emissions between validation documents, with an earlier figure of 19,788 tCO₂e and a later verified figure of 8,652 tCO₂e. Because CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, dual-market risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

- + The record includes a monitoring report, validation report, PDD, and issuance-related documentation, with high extraction confidence.
- The monitoring report itself records several corrective actions and missing source documents, including technical equipment details and calibration certificates.

Documentation quality is fair overall because multiple core documents are present, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material, and extraction confidence is high. But the monitoring report itself lists numerous corrective actions and missing evidence, such as calibration certificates, JMRs, invoices, and supporting breakdown documents. The crediting period is also much longer than the single monitoring period captured here, so the documentation set is not fully complete for a full-period assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project with no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed in monitoring report
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the missing supporting evidence for the monitoring period, including calibration certificates, invoices, JMRs, and technical equipment documentation.

→ Clarify leakage treatment and reconcile the emissions discrepancy between the earlier validation figure and the later verified issuance claim.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-C64E4ED8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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