QUALITY REPORT

5 MW Brahm Ganga Hydro – Electric Project At Kullu District Of Himachal Pradesh, India

VCS-493 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-121DB756 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.6
Transparency (25%)	6.1
Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected small hydro VCS project using AMS-I.D with additionality confirmed by the VVB, which supports baseline integrity in principle. However, multiple MRV and reporting issues (including inconsistent generation and meter calibration records) and unresolved leakage treatment reduce confidence in the quantified emission reductions and increase over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-493
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D. 15.0
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	TUV SUD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Verified ERs	38,232 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	16 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Monitoring report lists numerous corrective actions, including inconsistencies between monthly generation values and supporting records (JMRs/invoices) and inconsistencies in calibration dates versus certificates.

■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (earlier report deems leakage negligible, later report does not address leakage), with no explicit leakage deduction stated.

■ Large contradiction in verified emission reductions between two validation reports (114,282 vs 38,232), indicating data reliability/version-control issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.

- The 2021 monitoring report requires many corrections (metering/calibration gaps and inconsistent generation evidence), weakening confidence in ER quantification.

Additionality is relatively strong on paper: the validation/verification record indicates an investment test and that additionality was confirmed by the VVB. Baseline setting is project-specific under AMS-I.D, and no baseline reassessment timing was found in the extracted record, which is a moderate weakness for long crediting periods. Integrity is materially weakened by the 2021 monitoring report's extensive corrective actions, including inconsistencies between reported generation and JMRs/invoices and incomplete/contradictory meter calibration information, which directly affects ER accuracy. Leakage is not robustly treated: the later monitoring report does not address leakage and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are disclosed (VVB identified as TÜV SÜD; monitoring period 2016-04-01 to 2018-04-01; claimed vs verified ERs both reported).

- The monitoring report itself flags missing/unclear information and inconsistent data, reducing transparency and auditability of calculations.

The project discloses core registry/MRV identifiers, including the VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd), monitoring period (2016-04-01 to 2018-04-01), and both claimed and verified ER totals. However, the 2021 monitoring report notes missing operational descriptions, inconsistent date formats, and incomplete month-wise ER calculation breakdowns, which reduces the ability for third parties to reproduce results. The presence of multiple internal inconsistencies flagged for correction also reduces confidence that the public-facing monitoring package is clean and self-consistent.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

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

- Contradictory ER figures across validation reports and weak leakage treatment increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-profile aviation-related claims. Over-crediting risk remains moderate because leakage is inconsistently handled (earlier documentation deems it negligible while the later monitoring report does not address it) and no explicit leakage deduction is evidenced in the extracted record. Claim safety is further reduced by the contradiction in verified ER totals across validation reports, which signals version-control or accounting issues that could confuse buyers and downstream claims.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are present (PDD, monitoring report, validation report) with high extraction confidence and a named VVB.

- The volume of corrective actions suggests documentation quality issues within the monitoring package despite document availability.

Document coverage is reasonably good (PDD, monitoring report, validation report listed) and the extraction confidence is high, supporting a solid documentation score. That said, the 2021 monitoring report contains a long list of required corrections (e.g., missing check-meter calibration details for the monitoring period and inconsistencies between calibration dates and certificates), indicating that while documents exist, their internal completeness/quality is uneven. No buffer pool information is found, but as an avoidance renewable energy project this is less central than MRV completeness.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals evidenced
Leakage	Leakage inconsistently addressed; no deduction evidenced
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance reported but inconsistent across docs
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a corrected monitoring report and calculation workbook that resolves all listed corrective actions, including complete check-meter calibration records and reconciled monthly generation against JMRs/invoices.

→ Provide a clear, consistent leakage assessment under AMS-I.D (including an explicit statement of leakage deduction, even if 0% with justification) and ensure the same position is carried across PDD/MR/verification outputs.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- 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-121DB756 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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