QUALITY REPORT

Grid Connected Electricity Generation Using Natural Gas By Lanco Kondapalli Power Limited

VCS-1261 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-20E4B5A3 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.4
	Transparency (25%)	6.1
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
	Documentation (15%)	7.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some core integrity elements (investment additionality confirmed by the VVB and no material findings reported), but key baseline and leakage quantification details are missing in the extracted record. Multiple cross-document inconsistencies—especially in credited/verified ERs and crediting period dates—raise reliability and over-crediting risk concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1261
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AM0029 03
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	114,254 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Large contradiction in claimed/verified emission reductions between 2014 and 2022 validation reports (1,460,844 vs 114,254), creating over-crediting and data reliability risk.

■ Leakage is described as quantified but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

■ Safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing are inconsistent across monitoring reports (2014 vs 2022), weakening confidence in social safeguard claims.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB.

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not found in the extracted record; leakage is said to be quantified but the actual deduction is not provided.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation/verification record confirms an investment test and VVB confirmation. However, the baseline is described as project-specific (monitoring/validation record) and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline robustness over time. Leakage treatment is described as quantified (monitoring report, 2022), but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, leaving an integrity gap. No material findings were reported (validation/verification record), which is positive, but the presence of multiple CARs suggests process weaknesses (monitoring report, 2022).

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ VVB is identified (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. / Applus+), and claimed ERs match verified ERs for the extracted monitoring period (114,254).

- Key MRV parameters (e.g., grid emission factor year/value) are not found in the extracted record, and ER totals conflict across documents.

The project identifies the VVB (Applus+ Certification) and provides a clear monitoring period (2012-08-01 to 2012-12-31) in the monitoring report (2022). For the extracted figures, claimed and verified ERs match at 114,254 (validation/verification record), which supports MRV consistency within that slice. However, key quantification inputs such as the grid emission factor value/year are not found in the extracted record, limiting reproducibility. Transparency is also undermined by major cross-document inconsistencies in total ERs (validation reports, 2014 vs 2022).

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Contradictory ER totals across validation reports and missing leakage deduction details increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible (registry/eligibility record), which reduces the risk of aviation-related double-claim pathways. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about broader high-integrity labeling. Over-crediting risk is elevated by the large contradiction in total ERs between validation reports (2014 vs 2022) and by missing leakage deduction details despite leakage being described as quantified (monitoring report, 2022). Corrective actions requesting an undertaking on no double accounting also indicate the verifier saw a need to tighten claims controls (monitoring report, 2022).

Documentation — 7.0 / 10

+ Multiple document types are available (monitoring report, validation report, PDD, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 9 documents used.

- Numerous corrective action requests in the monitoring report (formatting/template and double-accounting undertaking) indicate documentation quality issues.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the extracted record includes monitoring, validation, PDD, and issuance evidence, with 9 documents used and high extraction confidence. The monitoring report dated 2022-02-11 is relatively recent, which helps. However, the monitoring report includes multiple corrective action requests (CAR 01–CAR 06), many tied to template compliance and parameter presentation, indicating weaknesses in document quality and consistency. In addition, contradictions across older vs newer documents (2014 vs 2022) suggest version control and record coherence issues.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● **Permanence**	No reversal risk indicated for grid power project
● **Leakage**	Leakage said quantified but deduction not evidenced
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistent across reports
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/clarify the full ER calculation package for the monitoring period, including grid emission factor source/year/value and the explicit leakage deduction percentage applied.

→ Resolve and document the reason for the large ER discrepancy between the 2014 and 2022 validation reports (scope, monitoring periods, aggregation, or corrections) and provide a reconciled issuance/verification trail.

→ Provide consistent, auditable safeguard evidence (FPIC records, grievance logs, benefit-sharing documentation) and explain why earlier monitoring documentation reported these as absent.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Report

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-20E4B5A3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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