

QUALITY REPORT

Hanuman Ganga Hydro (4.95 MW) Plant At Uttarakhand

VCS-274 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-039E3C94 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This small hydro VCS project has VVB-confirmed additionality, but the monitoring/verification record shows significant MRV weaknesses (missing generation data, unclear monitoring period, and meter calibration gaps) that increase over-crediting risk. Multiple cross-document inconsistencies (including two different verified ER totals) reduce confidence in the reliability of reported outcomes.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-274
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D Version 13
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	39,492 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large MRV deficiencies flagged in the monitoring report, including missing electricity generation data (Apr 2010–Dec 2012) and missing meter calibration details, with a request to recalculate emission reductions
- Contradictory emission reduction totals across documents (39,492 vs 51,894) undermine confidence in the credited quantity
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (earlier validation says quantified; later monitoring record shows leakage not addressed while applying 0% deduction)

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).
- The monitoring report (2021) lists major MRV gaps (missing generation data, unclear monitoring period, and meter calibration not performed as per the monitoring plan), increasing over-crediting risk.

The project uses a grid-connected renewable electricity methodology (AMS I.D, version 13) and additionality is confirmed by the VVB per the extracted record. However, the monitoring report (2021) raises serious MRV integrity concerns: electricity generation data are missing for Apr 2010–Dec 2012, the monitoring period is not consistently defined, and meter calibration details are missing with an explicit request to recalculate emission reductions. Leakage is applied as a 0% deduction while the monitoring report (2021) indicates leakage was not addressed, which weakens the completeness of the quantification approach.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + Key project attributes are identifiable (VCS registry, methodology AMS I.D v13, VVB named, monitoring and crediting periods stated in the monitoring report).
- The monitoring report (2021) indicates internal inconsistencies in definitions and periods and missing supporting evidence, reducing MRV transparency and auditability.

The extracted record provides the VVB name (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. / Applus+), the monitoring period (2010-04-01 to 2016-03-27), and an explicit grid emission factor value (0.803), which supports basic traceability. Transparency is reduced because the monitoring report (2021) flags missing breakdown details, inconsistent parameter definitions across the monitoring report and ER sheet, and unclear monitoring-period boundaries. The presence of many corrective actions suggests the public-facing MRV narrative may not be readily reproducible from the documentation as submitted.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

- Conflicting ER totals across documents (39,492 vs 51,894) create a material risk that public claims could overstate verified impact.
- ~ CORSIA and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so downstream eligibility/claim constraints cannot be confirmed.

Claim safety is weakened by contradictory ER quantities across documents: the extracted contradictions show 39,492 tCO₂e versus 51,894 tCO₂e reported as claimed/verified in different validation reports (2012 vs 2021). The monitoring report (2021) also notes conditions that could materially affect ERs (missing generation data, calibration not performed as per the monitoring plan, and potential DG set use during grid failure needing clarification), all of which elevate over-crediting and greenwashing risk if claims are not carefully bounded. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on those labels to reduce reputational risk.

Documentation — 6.3 / 10

- + Multiple document types are present (monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and extraction confidence is high.
- Numerous corrective actions were required in the monitoring report (2021), indicating incomplete/weak documentation at verification time.

Documentation coverage is moderate: the evidence set includes monitoring report, validation report, and issuance, with five documents used and high extraction confidence. Nonetheless, the monitoring report (2021) lists extensive missing supporting documents (including for 'No Net Harm' and stakeholder communication mechanisms) and multiple internal inconsistencies requiring correction. The volume and severity of corrective actions indicate that, despite document availability, the underlying evidentiary package was not complete or consistently presented at the time of review.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal pool needed
● Leakage	0% deduction but justification inconsistent
● Baseline	Baseline approach not clearly stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned but inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a corrected monitoring report/ER sheet package that resolves the monitoring-period definition, provides complete generation data for the full period, and includes meter serial numbers and calibration records consistent with the monitoring plan.

→ Provide a clear, consistent leakage assessment (even if zero) with explicit justification aligned across validation/monitoring documents, and reconcile the ER total discrepancy (39,492 vs 51,894) with an auditable explanation.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- 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-039E3C94 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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