QUALITY REPORT

Natural Gas Based Grid Connected Power Project At Peddapuram, A.P. By Gautami Power Limited

VCS-1002 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-CE495D4D · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.4
Transparency (25%)	4.8
Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some integrity support because additionality was confirmed by the VVB and the verification found no material findings, but key risk controls are thinly documented. Transparency and documentation are limited by missing public-facing MRV details, no stated leakage deduction, and weak safeguards evidence; the record also contains contradictions on safeguards and the crediting period that reduce confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1002
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AM0029 03
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	SIRIM QAS International Sdn Bhd
Verified ERs	2,600,983 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2011
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

■ No buffer pool or reversal management is stated, so permanence protection is not evidenced in the extracted record.

■ Safeguards are weakly documented: FPIC and a grievance mechanism are not found, and the record contradicts itself on whether safeguards were mentioned.

■ The crediting period is inconsistent across documents, which raises reliability concerns about the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ The VVB confirmed additionality through an investment test, and the verification report recorded no material findings.

- Leakage treatment is not quantified in the extracted record, and no buffer pool or reversal management is stated.

Additionality is reasonably supported because the verification report confirms an investment test and the VVB found no material findings. However, permanence and leakage controls are only partially evidenced: no buffer pool is stated, no reversal events are reported, and leakage treatment is described only as quantified without a visible deduction percentage in the extracted record.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period and verification outcome are identified, and the total verified reductions match the total claimed reductions.

- Public MRV detail is thin: the grid emission factor, usage monitoring method, and leakage deduction are not stated in available documents.

The monitoring period and verification totals are clearly stated, and the verified reductions equal the claimed reductions. Even so, important MRV details are missing from available documents, including the grid emission factor, the usage monitoring method, and a specific leakage deduction, which limits transparency.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

+ The verified and claimed emission reductions are identical, which reduces immediate over-issuance concern.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized baseline, and CORSIA eligibility is false while CCP status is not stated.

Claim safety is moderate because the verified and claimed emission totals match exactly, reducing obvious over-crediting concerns. That said, the baseline is project-specific under AM0029 rather than a clearly standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and the project is not CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not stated, leaving some market-claim uncertainty.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ Twelve documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- The record lacks key safeguards documentation and contains contradictions on safeguards and the crediting period.

Documentation quality is mixed: twelve documents were used and extraction confidence is medium, which is better than a poor record. But safeguards are weakly documented, with FPIC and a grievance mechanism not found, and the record does not show corrective actions; this is further weakened by contradictions in the extracted documents.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No buffer pool stated
Leakage	Leakage not clearly quantified
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
Safeguards	No FPIC or grievance evidence
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full monitoring and verification package showing the leakage deduction, baseline calculations, and any buffer or reversal provisions.

→ Publish clear safeguards evidence, including FPIC, grievance procedures, and any benefit-sharing or stakeholder consultation records.

Documents Reviewed

- VCS Monitoring Report GVK Gautami project, version02 - 29 Mar 13.pdf
- Project Transfer Request _PL1002.pdf
- Declaration of Agency_PL1002.pdf
- Gautami PPRR-14.07.2011.PDF
- Communication Agreement_PL1002.pdf
- Gautami Power 469 MW NG CCPP-PDD-22Aug11.pdf
- Gautami Power_VCS PD-final.pdf
- Deed_GautamiVCS.pdf
- Revised validation report.pdf
- VCS Issuance Representation, Single Representor, v3.2.pdf
- FVeR GVK Gautami VCS revised- May 13.pdf
- FVR of Gautami VCS project.pdf

Report ID: CM-CE495D4D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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