

QUALITY REPORT

50 MW Sipansihaporas Hydro Power Plant, North Sumatra

VCS-486 · VCS · Indonesia

Report ID: CM-CAB5B6B2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected hydro project under ACM0002 with additionality stated as an investment test and confirmed by the VVB, but several internal inconsistencies across documents raise over-crediting and data-reliability concerns. Safeguards and stakeholder provisions appear stronger in later documents, yet earlier records conflict, and leakage treatment is not consistently justified.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-486
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Indonesia
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 17.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2026
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Verified ERs	585,739 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	37 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large inconsistencies in reported and verified emission reductions across documents (e.g., claimed values differ within the same date and verified values change materially between 2018 and 2022).
- Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2006–2016 vs 2016–2026), creating uncertainty about eligibility boundaries and baseline applicability.
- Leakage is taken as 0% but is either not addressed or only deemed negligible depending on the document, weakening confidence in completeness of the GHG boundary treatment.
- Multiple corrective actions were raised against the monitoring report and project description (including inconsistencies between reported parameters and the ER spreadsheet).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.6 / 10

+ Additionality is supported by an investment test and is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).

- Baseline and quantification inputs show reliability issues (grid emission factor differs across documents and leakage is not consistently justified), alongside numerous corrective actions in the 2022 monitoring cycle.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed using an investment test and confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. However, the baseline is project-specific and the last reassessment is dated 2009, while key quantification inputs vary across documents (e.g., grid emission factor differs between the 2018 monitoring report and the 2022 validation report). Leakage is deducted at 0%, but the 2022 monitoring report does not address leakage while an earlier monitoring report deems it negligible, weakening boundary completeness. Numerous corrective actions in the 2022 monitoring cycle (including inconsistencies between monitored parameters and the ER spreadsheet and missing technical details) further reduce confidence in the integrity of quantified outcomes.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ Key project attributes are available (methodology ACM0002 v17.0, VVB identified as TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, monitoring period 2017-05-01 to 2020-12-31).

- Reported figures are inconsistent across documents (claimed and verified ER values conflict), reducing MRV clarity for third parties.

The project discloses core MRV elements such as the monitoring period (2017-05-01 to 2020-12-31), applied methodology (ACM0002 v17.0), and the VVB (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH). Transparency is undermined by conflicting emissions-reduction totals across documents, making it difficult to reconcile what was claimed versus what was ultimately verified. The 2022 monitoring report also triggered multiple corrective actions, suggesting that reporting completeness and internal consistency required significant remediation.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory ER totals and differing grid emission factors used across documents, plus unclear leakage justification despite a 0% deduction.

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of problematic aviation-related claims. Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened by material inconsistencies in emission reduction totals (claimed and verified) and by differing grid emission factors across documents, both of which can drive over-crediting risk in grid-connected renewable projects. Leakage treatment is also inconsistent (0% deduction with either no discussion or only a negligible assertion), which increases greenwashing risk if claims imply comprehensive accounting.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ A relatively large document set is referenced (29 documents including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- The presence of many corrective actions and multiple cross-document contradictions indicates documentation quality/control weaknesses.

The extracted record references a substantial evidence base (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance; 29 documents used) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting a moderate-to-strong documentation score. However, the 2022 monitoring report lists numerous corrective actions, including missing technical details and inconsistencies between reported monitoring parameters and the ER spreadsheet, indicating documentation and QA/QC weaknesses. Multiple contradictions across monitoring and validation/verification documents further reduce confidence that the documentation set is internally coherent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● Leakage	0% leakage with inconsistent justification
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing dated/unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reported later but contradicted earlier
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation table across versions showing why emission reductions, grid emission factors, and any calculation tools/spreadsheets changed between the 2018 and 2022 validation/monitoring cycles.

→ Resolve the crediting-period discrepancy with registry-linked evidence and ensure all monitoring/verification documents consistently reflect the correct crediting period and applicable baseline parameters.

→ Provide an explicit leakage assessment consistent with ACM0002 requirements (even if negligible) and ensure the justification is consistent across the PDD and monitoring reports.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- 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-CAB5B6B2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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