QUALITY REPORT

1 MW Jiwa Small Hydel Project in Kullu, Himachal Pradesh

VCS-531 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-155E98E1 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
5.0 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	4.8
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
	Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS hydropower project with some positive safeguards evidence, including FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing described in the monitoring report. However, key carbon-accounting details are missing or weakly documented, and there is a major discrepancy in verified emissions reductions that raises reliability concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-531
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Grid connected renewable electricity generation 13
Crediting Period	2007 — 2017
VVB	VKU Certification Private Limited
Verified ERs	44,175 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The documents do not state the baseline method, and leakage is marked as not addressed in the monitoring record.
- There is a large contradiction in verified emissions reductions: one document shows 10,539 while a later validation report shows 44,175, which weakens confidence in the reported claim.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports the project’s core eligibility case.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and no baseline method or reassessment timing is stated in the extracted record.

The VVB confirmed additionality, which is a meaningful positive for project integrity. At the same time, the extracted record does not state the baseline method, and leakage is explicitly marked as not addressed in the monitoring report. No reversal events are reported, but there is also no buffer pool information in the available record, so permanence evidence is only partial.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The project has multiple official documents in the extracted set, including validation, issuance, and monitoring records, and the extraction confidence is high.

- The monitoring and validation records contain a major emissions-reduction discrepancy, and meter-related corrective actions were still requested in the latest monitoring report.

The project has a reasonably broad document trail, including validation, issuance, and monitoring records, and the extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report requested corrective actions on the site address and meter installation, which suggests the MRV trail was not fully clean. The large mismatch between claimed and verified emissions reductions also reduces transparency because it makes the reported numbers harder to reconcile.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

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

- The baseline approach is not stated, leakage is not addressed, and the verified emissions figures conflict sharply across documents.

Claim safety is weakened by missing baseline detail and the absence of a leakage treatment in the monitoring report. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-market claim risk, but the record does not provide enough detail on baseline robustness or usage assumptions to support a strong low-overcrediting assessment. The conflicting emissions-reduction figures further increase the risk that the claim could be overstated or inconsistently reported.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ The extracted record includes 11 documents and the extraction confidence is high, which supports documentation quality.

- The latest monitoring report still required corrective actions, including fixing the site address and checking meter installation, indicating incomplete operational documentation.

Documentation quality is moderate to good because the extracted set includes 11 documents and the extraction confidence is high. The latest monitoring report also shows that safeguards were discussed, with FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing described. However, the need for corrective actions on basic site and metering details indicates that the documentation was not fully complete or fully aligned across records.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project with no reversal events reported
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed
● **Baseline**	Baseline method not stated
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards present but inconsistently documented
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear baseline methodology and any reassessment history, with a reconciled explanation for the emissions-reduction figures across documents.

→ Document leakage treatment, buffer or permanence safeguards if applicable, and close out the meter and site-address corrective actions in a subsequent verification.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report

Report ID: CM-155E98E1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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