QUALITY REPORT

15 MW Nam Hinboun Downstream Hydropower Project

VCS-3662 · VCS · Lao

Report ID: CM-9AAFB669 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	6.7
	Transparency (25%)	6.1
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	Documentation (15%)	7.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS hydropower project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported, which supports a moderate-to-strong integrity profile. However, leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents and the credited volume and crediting period differ between versions, which weakens confidence in the claim. The project appears reasonably documented, but the contradictions and missing details on some MRV elements keep the risk rating from being high.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3662
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Lao
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS I.D 18.0
Crediting Period	2022 — 2028
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Verified ERs	33,952 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	16 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The documents conflict on leakage treatment: the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while the validation report says it was deemed negligible.
- The verified emission reduction figure and crediting period differ across documents, indicating reliability and version-control concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.7 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and the VVB confirmed it in the monitoring report.

- Leakage justification is inconsistent across documents, and the monitoring report records a 0% leakage deduction with leakage not addressed.

The monitoring report confirms additionality through an investment test and states that the VVB, 4K Earth Science Private Limited, verified the project. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, which is positive. Integrity is held back by the leakage record: the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while the validation report later says it was deemed negligible, so the treatment is not fully consistent.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and matching claimed and verified emission reductions in the monitoring report.

- Usage monitoring details are not stated, and the record contains conflicting values for verified emissions and the crediting period.

The project has a clear monitoring period and a named verifier, and the monitoring report reports 33,952 verified emission reductions matching the claimed amount in that document. Transparency is weakened because the usage monitoring method is not stated in the extracted record, and the contradiction list shows different verified emission totals across validation documents. The absence of buffer pool information also limits visibility into risk management.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is a renewable hydropower activity under VCS, with no material findings reported in the monitoring report.

- Leakage treatment is weakly supported, and the contradictory verified emission figures reduce confidence in the claimed climate benefit.

Claim safety is moderate because this is a renewable hydropower project under VCS and the monitoring report reports no material findings. Still, the leakage narrative is inconsistent, with one document saying leakage was not addressed and another saying it was negligible, which raises over-crediting risk. The contradictory verified emission totals also reduce confidence in the exact scale of the claim.

Documentation — 7.0 / 10

+ Sixteen documents were used and extraction confidence is high, with a recent monitoring report dated 2023-11-06.

- Some key items are not stated in available documents, including buffer pool coverage and usage monitoring method.

Documentation quality is fairly strong: 16 documents were used, extraction confidence is high, and the monitoring report is recent. The project also includes safeguards evidence such as FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing description. However, several key fields are not stated in available documents, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and usage monitoring details.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project with no reversal events reported
● **Leakage**	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● **Baseline**	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● **Safeguards**	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled emissions statement that explains the differences between the verified emission totals and crediting period versions.

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and document the monitoring method, buffer treatment, and any baseline reassessment schedule.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-9AAFB669 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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