

QUALITY REPORT

4.5 MW Grouped Small Hydropower Projects For Grid System By Boruka Power Corporation Limited In Karnataka State, India.

VCS-265 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-C0BFE169 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|-----------------------|------------|
| ■ Integrity (35%) | 4.3 |
| ■ Transparency (25%) | 4.8 |
| ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 4.1 |
| ■ Documentation (15%) | 5.0 |

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS hydropower project with VVB-confirmed additionality, but the evidence base shows several documentation and accounting weaknesses. The biggest concerns are unresolved leakage treatment, missing safeguards documentation, and a large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Registry | Verra (VCS) |
| Registry ID | VCS-265 |
| Sector | renewable_energy |
| Country | India |
| Vintage | Stale |
| Project Methodology | AMS I.D Version 13 |
| Crediting Period | 2006 — 2016 |
| VVB | TÜV NORD CERT GmbH |
| Verified ERs | 17,413 tCO ₂ e |
| Monitoring Period | 2013 — 2016 |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 17 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-14 |

Red Flags

- The monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while an earlier report said it was quantified, creating uncertainty about whether leakage was properly handled.
- Claimed emission reductions were 26,723 in one report but only 17,413 were verified later, indicating a substantial over-claim risk.
- No grievance mechanism, FPIC, or other safeguards were documented in the extracted record, and corrective actions were still required.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.3 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which supports the project's core eligibility case.

- Leakage treatment is weak: the monitoring report states leakage was not addressed and applies a 0% deduction, while an earlier report said leakage was quantified.

The project's additionality is relatively strong because the validation report says the VVB confirmed it through a combined test. However, integrity is weakened by the leakage record: the monitoring report states leakage was not addressed and applies a 0% deduction, even though an earlier monitoring report is said to have quantified leakage. The project is an avoidance activity, so reversal risk is lower than for removals, but the absence of buffer pool information still leaves a permanence evidence gap.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, and a defined monitoring period from 2013-01-01 to 2016-02-29.

- The record shows a large discrepancy between claimed and verified emission reductions, and several corrective actions remained open in the monitoring report.

Transparency is mixed. The project has a named verifier, TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, and a clear monitoring period, but the record also shows a large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions, which makes the accounting trail harder to trust. The monitoring report contains numerous corrective actions, including missing meter details, calibration information, and joint meter reading clarification, which suggests incomplete MRV documentation.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

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

- The verified emissions are far below the claimed amount, and the baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized or jurisdictional approach.

Claim safety is limited by the over-claiming signal and weak leakage treatment. The validation report shows 26,723 claimed emission reductions, while a later validation report shows only 17,413 verified, which is a material downward revision. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-claim risk, but the project-specific baseline and unresolved leakage questions still leave over-crediting concerns.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ The extracted record includes multiple official document types, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material.

- The monitoring report lists many corrective actions, and key items such as buffer pool treatment, grievance register, and usage monitoring details were not found in the extracted record.

Documentation quality is moderate rather than strong. The extracted record includes several official documents and the extraction confidence is high, but the monitoring report still lists many corrective actions and missing items such as grievance register submission, calibration details, and meter documentation. The crediting period is long and the monitoring period is later, but the record does not show a fully clean and complete documentation trail.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| ● Additionality | VVB-confirmed additionality |
| ● Permanence | No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated |
| ● Leakage | Leakage treatment inconsistent |
| ● Baseline | Project baseline, reassessment not stated |
| ● Safeguards | No safeguards evidence found |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA ineligible, CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions accounting note that explains the difference between claimed and verified reductions and documents the final accepted figure.

→ Submit complete leakage, safeguards, grievance, and metering evidence, including any buffer pool treatment and the basis for the 0% leakage deduction.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report
- Validation 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-C0BFE169 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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