QUALITY REPORT

Adavikanda, Kuruwita Division Mini Hydro Power Project

GS-1060 · GS · Sri Lanka

Report ID: CM-805DD44B · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6 Overall Score out of 10		
	Integrity (35%)	4.8
	Transparency (25%)	4.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.5
	Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a named verifier, but the evidence base is weakened by unresolved leakage treatment, no buffer pool information, and multiple corrective actions in the verification report. Transparency is limited by missing claimed/verified issuance figures and several key MRV details not stated in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1060
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Sri Lanka
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D Version 18
Crediting Period	2016 — 2017
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is not addressed and no deduction is stated, which is a material gap for credit quality.
- ■ The verification report lists four findings and required corrective actions, indicating unresolved documentation or implementation issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by TÜV NORD CERT GmbH in the verification report, using an investment test.

- Leakage treatment is not addressed and no buffer pool or reversal management detail is stated in the available documents.

The verification report from 2019 confirms additionality through an investment test and names TÜV NORD CERT GmbH as the VVB, which supports the project’s core crediting case. However, leakage is marked as not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and the report records four findings with corrective actions required, all of which weaken integrity confidence. No reversal events are described, but permanence evidence is incomplete because the extracted record does not show how reversal risk is managed.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier and a defined monitoring period in the verification report.

- Claimed versus verified emission reductions are not stated, and key MRV items such as usage monitoring and usage rate are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is moderate at best because the project has a named verifier and a defined monitoring period, but the extracted record does not provide claimed or verified issuance totals. Important MRV details such as usage monitoring method, usage rates, and any quantified FNRB treatment are not found in the available documents. The documentation is therefore partially traceable but not fully auditable from the extracted facts alone.

Claim Safety — 4.5 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline under AMS-I.D, which is at least a defined methodology framework.

- Leakage justification is not addressed, and CORSIA eligibility / CCP status are not stated, leaving residual over-claiming risk.

Claim safety is constrained by missing leakage treatment and the absence of stated CORSIA eligibility or CCP status. The project uses a project baseline under AMS-I.D, but there is no evidence here of a recent reassessment or a standardized jurisdictional baseline that would reduce over-crediting risk. Because the record does not show verified usage rates or quantified leakage deductions, the risk of overstated climate claims remains material.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ Five document sources were used, including monitoring, validation, verification, and PDD material.

- The verification report lists CAR 01, CAR 02, CL 01, and CL 02, showing that the documentation was not fully clean.

The evidence base is broader than a single report, with five document sources referenced, including monitoring, validation, verification, and PDD materials. Even so, the verification report lists four findings and required corrective actions, which suggests the file was not fully complete or fully consistent at the time of review. Extraction confidence is high, so the main documentation weakness is substantive completeness rather than readability.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No reversal detail or buffer pool stated
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed
● **Baseline**	Project baseline stated, reassessment not found
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and benefit sharing present, grievance mechanism incons
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a quantified leakage assessment, including any deduction or justification for why leakage is negligible.

→ Publish the verified issuance figures, buffer pool treatment, and a clear resolution of all CARs and CLs from the verification process.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_22.11.2016 to 23.08.2017_v3.pdf
- GS Passport_07.10.2017_v1.pdf
- PDD_31.01.2019_v6.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1060
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1060
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_22.11.2016 to 23.0.2017_v3.pdf
- Validation Report_10.10.2018_v1.pdf

Report ID: CM-805DD44B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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