

QUALITY REPORT

# 21.8 MW Wind Power Project at Jangi Vandhiya, Gujarat by Powerica Limited

VCS-1823 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-39AF9230 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

## Assessment Summary

This is a registered wind project with VVB-verified additionality and a clear project baseline, but the evidence set shows material reliability and claim-quality concerns. The biggest issues are the large discrepancy between claimed and verified emission reductions, leakage not being addressed in the newer monitoring report, and a double-counting warning tied to other GHG programmes and India’s REC mechanism.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1823
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 15.02
Crediting Period	2014 — 2024
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	38,520 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

## Red Flags

- The monitoring report flags a need for a declaration to avoid double counting because the project was registered in another GHG reductions programme and with India's REC mechanism.
- Verified emission reductions for 2022 were 38,520, far below the 203,799 claimed in the earlier validation record, indicating a major claim discrepancy.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the 2023 monitoring report, while an older report had treated it as negligible.
- The monitoring report lists several corrective actions, including template non-compliance and inconsistencies with the registered monitoring plan.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.6 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring record.
- Leakage is not addressed in the 2023 monitoring report, and the report also notes inconsistencies with the registered monitoring plan.

The project has a reasonably solid additionality basis because the monitoring record says an investment test was used and the VVB confirmed it. However, integrity is weakened by the 2023 monitoring report stating leakage is not addressed, by the absence of any buffer pool or reversal information, and by corrective actions noting inconsistencies with the registered monitoring plan. The project is an avoidance-style wind project, so permanence risk is inherently low, but the documentation does not fully close out all integrity questions.

### Transparency — 4.1 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB and a defined 2022 monitoring period in the monitoring report.
- The monitoring report required corrective actions for incomplete sections, outdated template use, and inconsistent parameters, which weakens reporting clarity.

Transparency is mixed. The monitoring report identifies the VVB, the 2022 monitoring period, and the project's reporting context, but it also lists several corrective actions for incomplete template sections, missing stakeholder communication detail, and inconsistent parameters. That combination suggests the reporting trail exists but is not fully clean or fully complete.

### Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

- + The project is a renewable wind installation under VCS with a project baseline, which is generally lower risk than many crediting categories.
- The verified 2022 issuance figure is much lower than the earlier claimed amount, and the report raises a double-counting concern with other programmes and REC mechanisms.

Claim safety is below average because the monitoring report flags a need for a declaration to avoid double counting with another GHG reductions programme and India's REC mechanism. The verified 2022 emission reductions of 38,520 are far below the earlier claimed 203,799, which raises over-crediting or at least claim-consistency concerns. The project type is a wind project under VCS, which is generally safer than many categories, but the specific evidence here is not strong enough for a high score.

### Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence.
- The monitoring report contains several corrective actions and some key items, such as buffer pool treatment and leakage deduction, are not stated in the extracted record.

Documentation breadth is decent because the extracted record draws on multiple official documents, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report includes several corrective actions, and some important items such as buffer pool treatment, leakage deduction, and usage monitoring details are not stated in available documents. The crediting period is also not perfectly aligned across documents, which reduces documentation quality somewhat.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Wind avoidance project
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment missing
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Dual-claim risk not resolved

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, current declaration and registry evidence showing no double counting across VCS, other GHG programmes, and India's REC mechanism.

→ Publish a fully reconciled monitoring package that explains the gap between claimed and verified reductions, addresses leakage explicitly, and resolves all corrective actions.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Validation 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-39AF9230 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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