

QUALITY REPORT

82 MW Lau Renun Hydro Power Plant, North Sumatra

VCS-488 · VCS · Indonesia

Report ID: CM-2595FF03 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.9
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a documented baseline method, but the evidence is weakened by major inconsistencies in emissions figures and weak leakage and safeguard documentation. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, and the record shows several unresolved corrective actions and contradictory statements across documents, which reduces confidence in the claimed climate benefit.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-488
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Indonesia
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 17.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2026
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Verified ERs	782,423 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	57 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The reported verified emissions reductions conflict sharply across validation and monitoring documents, suggesting reliability issues in the claimed issuance volume.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the latest monitoring record, and safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism are not documented as in place.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, and the project uses a stated regulatory-surplus test in the later validation record.

- Leakage is not addressed in the latest monitoring report, and the record shows unresolved corrective actions including additionality and emissions-justification issues.

The project has some support on additionality because the validation record from TÜV NORD CERT GmbH confirms it, and the later validation material describes a regulatory-surplus approach. However, the latest monitoring report lists leakage as not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and multiple corrective actions remain open, including additionality justification and emissions-source explanations. These weaknesses materially reduce confidence in the robustness of the crediting basis.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has multiple official documents available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with a high extraction confidence.

- The monitoring record leaves usage monitoring not stated, and the emissions reduction figures differ materially between documents.

Transparency is mixed: the project has a substantial document set, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and extraction confidence is high. Still, usage monitoring is not stated in the available record, and the emissions reduction totals differ sharply between documents, which makes the public record harder to interpret. The baseline method is stated as project-based, but the documentation does not provide a clearly recent reassessment narrative beyond the 2017 reference.

Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of dual-claim risk.

- The verified emissions reduction figure conflicts with earlier reported values, and the latest leakage justification is listed as not addressed.

Claim safety is weakened by the large discrepancy between the claimed and verified emissions reduction figures across documents, which raises over-crediting concerns. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but the latest monitoring report says leakage is not addressed and the grid emission factor changed between validation records. With no CCP status stated, the overall claim-safety picture remains cautious.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ The record includes 57 extracted documents and a named VVB, which supports basic documentation depth.

- Several corrective actions remain listed, and the crediting period was revised across documents, indicating documentation inconsistency over time.

Documentation breadth is decent, with 57 extracted documents and a named verifier, and the extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report lists many corrective actions, including project-description, methodology, and leakage-related items, and the crediting period appears to have been revised across documents. That combination suggests the file is substantial but not fully clean or internally stable.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality present but contested
● Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed in latest record
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment limited
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism not documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible and no CCP approval stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions accounting note that explains the discrepancy between claimed and verified reductions across the validation and monitoring records.

→ Document leakage treatment, safeguard implementation, and any remaining corrective action closures with clear evidence from the latest monitoring cycle.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Review Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Proof of Ownership
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- 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-2595FF03 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy