QUALITY REPORT

Rio Taquesi Hydroelectric Power Project

VCS-2089 · VCS · Bolivia, Plurinational State of

Report ID: CM-02946B4C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.1
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.0

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project has VVB-confirmed additionality via an investment test and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the extracted record. However, leakage is not addressed, baseline reassessment timing is not stated, and key inconsistencies (notably the crediting period) reduce confidence in the reliability of the record and increase over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2089
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Bolivia, Plurinational State of
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 8
Crediting Period	2009 — 2016
VVB	SGS United Kingdom Ltd
Verified ERs	286,328 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Verified ERs exceed claimed ERs for the same monitoring period (286,328 verified vs 249,802 claimed), which raises data consistency and over-crediting concerns.
- ■ Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, despite renewable energy projects often requiring explicit leakage treatment under the methodology.
- ■ Crediting period is inconsistent across documents (monitoring report vs validation report), undermining confidence in project boundary/eligibility timing.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.

- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the monitoring report, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record.

The monitoring/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record). The baseline is described as project-specific (extracted record), but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens confidence in baseline validity over time. Leakage is explicitly noted as not addressed in the monitoring report (2012), and no leakage deduction is stated, which is a substantive integrity gap for credit quantification.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ A named VVB (SGS United Kingdom Ltd) and a clearly stated monitoring period (2011-03-01 to 2012-06-30) support MRV traceability.

- Key quantitative fields are missing or inconsistent, including claimed vs verified ERs and missing baseline reassessment year.

The monitoring report (2012-10-24) provides a defined monitoring period (2011-03-01 to 2012-06-30) and identifies the VVB as SGS United Kingdom Ltd, supporting audit traceability. However, the extracted record shows a major inconsistency between claimed and verified emission reductions (249,802 claimed vs 286,328 verified), which reduces transparency on how figures were derived and reconciled. Several MRV-relevant fields (e.g., grid EF year, usage monitoring method) are not stated in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream double-claiming/eligibility risks.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by the mismatch between claimed and verified ERs and by the lack of explicit leakage treatment.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible (extracted record), which lowers the risk of certain aviation-related claims and associated double-claiming narratives. Nonetheless, the mismatch where verified ERs exceed claimed ERs (monitoring/issuance figures in the extracted record) increases perceived over-crediting and reporting risk for external claims. Leakage being not addressed in the monitoring report (2012) further increases greenwashing risk because stakeholders cannot see how potential upstream/downstream effects were handled.

Documentation — 7.0 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are present (monitoring report, validation report, PDD, issuance) and extraction confidence is high.

- Contradictions between documents (crediting period; safeguards mention) indicate documentation coherence issues.

The evidence set includes key document types (monitoring report, validation report, PDD, issuance) with high extraction confidence, supporting a relatively strong documentation score. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is a positive signal for audit outcomes. However, contradictions across documents (crediting period and whether safeguards are mentioned) indicate that the documentation is not fully coherent and requires reconciliation.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
Leakage	Leakage not addressed
Baseline	Project-specific; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	No FPIC or grievance mechanism evidenced
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide an explicit leakage assessment consistent with ACM0002 (v8), including a quantified leakage deduction (even if 0%) with clear justification in the monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Reconcile and publicly clarify the crediting period discrepancy between the validation report (2009) and monitoring report (2012), and provide a clear baseline reassessment history (grid EF year/source and any updates).

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-02946B4C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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