

QUALITY REPORT

# Vajrakarur Wind Power Project In Andhra Pradesh

VCS-1214 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-A5B50B24 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

## Assessment Summary

The project is a grid-connected wind activity under ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB, but the extracted record shows major internal inconsistencies in emission reduction figures and crediting-period dates across documents. Leakage is treated as 0% yet is inconsistently justified, and the monitoring/verification trail includes numerous corrective actions and missing evidence requests, increasing over-crediting and reliability risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1214
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 13.0.01
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	3,555 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	31 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Large inconsistencies in reported/verified emission reductions across validation/monitoring documents (e.g., 3,555 vs 59,885 and claimed totals also conflict).
- Leakage is set to 0% while justification is inconsistent across monitoring reports ("not addressed" vs "deemed negligible").
- Safeguards and grievance mechanism are inconsistently reported over time (present in 2022 MR but absent in 2014 MR), and FPIC is contradictory between the PDD and MR.
- Extensive corrective actions cite missing core evidence (calibration certificates, JMR/invoices, PPAs/commissioning certificates) and calculation inconsistencies.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.6 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed using an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation).

- Monitoring/verification raised multiple CARs on ER calculations, metering/calibration evidence, and missing supporting documents, undermining confidence in quantified ERs (monitoring report, 2022-07-25).

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the project uses an investment test and this is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation). However, integrity is weakened by the monitoring report (2022-07-25) listing numerous corrective actions, including inconsistencies between the emission reduction calculation and the monitoring report, wrong percentage-difference calculations, and missing metering/calibration and operational evidence. Leakage is applied as a 0% deduction, but the monitoring record alternates between not addressing leakage and deeming it negligible, which is not robustly substantiated for conservative accounting (monitoring reports dated 2022-07-25 and 2022-07-12). As an avoidance renewable project, reversal risk is inherently low, but no buffer pool information is provided in the extracted record.

### Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ VVB is clearly identified (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. / Applus+), and the monitoring period and grid emission factor are stated (monitoring report, 2022-07-25).

- Key headline numbers are contradictory across documents (claimed/verified ERs and crediting period), reducing registry-grade transparency (validation/monitoring reports, 2013–2022).

The project provides basic MRV identifiers such as the VVB name, a defined monitoring period (2022-03-01 to 2022-03-30), and a stated grid emission factor of 0.8971 (monitoring report, 2022-07-25). Transparency is materially reduced by conflicting headline figures across documents, including claimed and verified emission reductions and inconsistent crediting-period dates (validation/monitoring reports, 2013–2022). The long list of CARs and requests for missing supporting documents (e.g., calibration certificates, JMR/invoices, PPAs/commissioning certificates) suggests that, at least at the time of review, the public/audit-ready evidence trail was incomplete (monitoring report, 2022-07-25).

### Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

+ The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (extracted record).

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory ER totals and CARs on calculation errors and missing metering/calibration support (validation/monitoring reports, 2021–2022).

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims (extracted record). Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened by strong over-crediting signals: the extracted record shows major contradictions in emission reduction totals between validation documents and monitoring documents, and the verification team raised CARs on calculation inconsistencies and missing metering/calibration support (monitoring report, 2022-07-25; validation reports dated 2022-07-12 and 2022-07-27). Leakage treatment is also inconsistent ("not addressed" vs "deemed negligible") while still applying 0% leakage, which increases the risk that credited reductions are overstated (monitoring reports dated 2022-07-25 and 2022-07-12). CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving an additional uncertainty for high-integrity claims.

## Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was extracted (24 documents) including PDD, monitoring, validation, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence (extracted record).

- The monitoring/verification trail shows many corrective actions and requests for missing primary evidence (e.g., calibration certificates, invoices/JMR, PPAs), indicating documentation gaps at audit time (monitoring report, 2022-07-25).

The extracted record indicates a substantial documentation base (24 documents) spanning PDD, monitoring, validation, and issuance, and the minimum extraction confidence is high, which supports a moderate documentation score (extracted record). However, the monitoring report (2022-07-25) contains extensive corrective actions and explicit requests for missing primary evidence (technical specifications, breakdown sheets, calibration certificates, JMR/invoices, PPAs, commissioning certificates, and double-counting declarations). These gaps and the need for multiple revisions (e.g., MR template alterations, editorial mistakes, unit corrections) indicate that documentation quality and completeness at audit time were uneven.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance renewable; reversal risk low
● <b>Leakage</b>	0% leakage with inconsistent justification
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC inconsistently documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled ER table that ties each monitoring period to final verified issuance, explicitly resolving the conflicting ER totals and crediting-period dates across documents.

→ Provide complete primary evidence packs referenced in CARs (meter calibration certificates, JMR/invoices, PPAs, commissioning certificates, turbine technical specs/breakdown logs) and a clear leakage assessment/justification consistent with ACM0002 requirements.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- 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-A5B50B24 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)