QUALITY REPORT

300MW Hydropower Project By JHPL

VCS-92 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-BD485611 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.7

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	4.2
Transparency (25%)	5.0
Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project uses an approved grid-connected renewable methodology (ACM0002) and additionality is confirmed by the VVB via a barrier analysis. However, the latest monitoring/verification record shows extensive corrective actions and missing supporting evidence (meters, calibration certificates, ER sheet, invoices), alongside major inconsistencies in reported ER figures and key parameters, which increases over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-92
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0002 17.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2026
VVB	LGAI TECHNOLOGICAL CENTER, S.A. (APPLUS+ CERTIFICATION)
Verified ERs	2,346,049 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	85 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Large mismatch between claimed and verified emission reductions (1,276,829 claimed vs 2,346,049 verified) and conflicting ER figures across documents, indicating data reliability/QA issues.

■ Extensive corrective actions in the 2024 monitoring/verification record, including missing meter installations, missing calibration certificates, missing ER sheet, and inconsistencies in diesel/SF6 parameters.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using a barrier analysis (validation/verification documentation).

- Monitoring/verification record (2024-11-16) lists multiple CARs and missing evidence (meters/calibration/ER sheet), undermining MRV integrity and increasing over-crediting risk.

The project applies ACM0002 with a project-specific baseline approach, and the validation/verification documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test. Integrity is weakened by the 2024-11-16 monitoring/verification record listing numerous corrective actions and evidence gaps (e.g., missing commissioning/technical documents, missing ER sheet, missing calibration certificates, and meters reportedly not installed as described). Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction, but the latest monitoring record states leakage was not addressed, which is a substantive methodological weakness for conservative accounting.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ VVB is identified (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. / Applus+) and a clear monitoring period is stated (2022-08-01 to 2024-07-31).

- Key reported figures and inputs are inconsistent across documents (ER totals, grid emission factor, crediting period), reducing transparency and traceability.

The monitoring period (2022-08-01 to 2024-07-31) and the VVB identity are clearly stated in the monitoring/verification record. Transparency is reduced by major inconsistencies across documents in key public-facing numbers (claimed/verified ER totals) and parameters (grid emission factor and even the stated crediting period). The long list of corrective actions in the 2024 monitoring/verification record also suggests the underlying MRV evidence trail is not readily auditable from the provided documentation set.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

+ Marked as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim double-claiming exposure.

- Leakage is treated as 0% while the latest monitoring record does not address leakage, and ER/accounting inputs show inconsistencies (grid EF, diesel/SF6), elevating greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of aviation-related double claiming. Claim safety remains weak because the latest monitoring/verification record highlights accounting and parameter issues (e.g., SF6 GWP not aligned with the standard, diesel emission factor inconsistencies, and CARs related to imported grid electricity emissions), all of which can materially affect credited volumes. In addition, leakage is effectively assumed at 0% while the latest monitoring record does not address leakage, increasing over-crediting and reputational risk.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

+ A substantial document set was extracted (48 documents including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Despite many documents, the 2024 monitoring/verification record indicates critical supporting documents were not provided (PPAs, commissioning evidence, invoices/JMR, calibration certificates, ER sheet).

The extracted record indicates a broad evidence base (48 documents including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and the extraction confidence is high, supporting a mid-level documentation score. However, the 2024-11-16 monitoring/verification record explicitly notes missing critical supporting documents (e.g., equipment/commissioning evidence, invoices/JMR, calibration certificates, ER sheet, and meter installation discrepancies). These missing items are fundamental to verifying generation and emissions calculations, so documentation completeness is materially compromised despite the number of documents.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● **Leakage**	0% deduction with weak/contradictory justification
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards claimed but inconsistently evidenced
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/submit complete MRV evidence for the monitoring period: ER calculation sheet, JMR and invoices with a documented cross-check procedure, meter inventory and single-line diagram, and calibration certificates covering the full period.

→ Resolve and document all cross-document inconsistencies (crediting period start date, grid emission factor basis/year, leakage treatment) with clear references to the applicable methodology/version and registry-approved parameters.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report
- 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-BD485611 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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