

QUALITY REPORT

210 MW Musi Hydro Power Plant, Bengkulu

VCS-487 · VCS · Indonesia

Report ID: CM-7EB963AA · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.3
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.9
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS hydropower project with a VVB-confirmed investment test and no material findings reported, but the documentation shows several unresolved corrective actions and a weak leakage treatment. The project’s crediting and emissions figures also changed across documents, which raises reliability concerns and lowers confidence in the claimed reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-487
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Indonesia
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 17.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2026
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Verified ERs	2,705,815 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	52 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The monitoring report lists many corrective actions and clarifications, including missing calibration details, inconsistent monitoring data, and justification gaps.
- The project's claimed and verified emission reduction figures differ substantially across documents, and the grid emission factor also changed between validation reports.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.3 / 10

- + Additionality was supported by an investment test and confirmed by the VVB in the verification materials.
- Leakage is not addressed in the latest monitoring report, even though an earlier report had treated it as negligible.

The project has a positive additionality signal because the investment test was verified by the VVB, and the verification record reports no material findings. However, integrity is weakened by the latest monitoring report's failure to address leakage, despite an earlier report describing it as negligible, and by the many corrective actions and clarifications raised in the monitoring process. The project is an avoidance project, so permanence risk is lower than for removals, but the overall integrity picture is still only moderate.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + A named VVB, TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, is identified, and the monitoring period is clearly stated in the 2022 report.
- The monitoring report contains many CARs and CLs, including missing technical and calibration details, which weakens MRV transparency.

Transparency is mixed. The monitoring period is clearly stated, the VVB is named, and the project has a documented registry presence, but the monitoring report also records numerous CARs and CLs tied to missing technical descriptions, calibration issues, and inconsistent monitoring values. That pattern suggests the MRV trail is present but not fully clean or easy to audit.

Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

- + The project is an avoidance project under VCS, which generally lowers reversal risk compared with removals.
- The latest documents show a large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions, and leakage justification is not addressed.

Claim safety is limited by the discrepancy between claimed and verified emission reductions across documents, with the verified figure in the later validation material far above the earlier claimed amount. The grid emission factor also changed between validation reports, which adds uncertainty to the baseline emissions estimate. Because leakage is not addressed in the latest report and the project is not CORSIA-eligible, the risk of overstated climate claims remains material.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + The record includes multiple official document types and a relatively large extraction set, with high extraction confidence.
- The monitoring report still required eight CARs, one FAR, and eight clarification requests, indicating incomplete documentation quality.

Documentation breadth is decent: the extraction draws on issuance, PDD, validation, and monitoring materials, and the extraction confidence is high. Still, the latest monitoring report required many corrective actions, including missing calibration details, inconsistent monitoring data, and methodological clarifications, which indicates that the documentation is not fully robust. The crediting period is also inconsistent across reports, showing that the record needs careful reconciliation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project
● Leakage	Not addressed in latest report
● Baseline	Project baseline with reassessment timing
● Safeguards	Safeguards present but inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a fully reconciled emissions accounting package that explains the differences between claimed and verified reductions, including the changing grid emission factor and crediting-period references.

→ Close out all CARs, FARs, and clarification requests with complete calibration evidence, monitoring-method details, and a clear leakage justification in the latest monitoring report.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-7EB963AA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy