QUALITY REPORT

8.35 MW Wind Power Project at Guddarangavana Halli, District Chitradurga, State Karnataka, India.

VCS-349 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-818D0926 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.1
	Transparency (25%)	4.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
	Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

This wind project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality through an investment test and no reported material findings. However, the record shows several documentation gaps, missing supporting files, and unresolved inconsistencies across reports, which weaken confidence in the claimed emissions reductions and safeguards.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-349
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 13
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	75,948 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	25 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- ■ The monitoring report lists many missing supporting documents and corrective actions, including missing technical specifications, PPA, and no double counting declaration.
- ■ There are contradictions in verified emissions reductions, leakage treatment, safeguards, and crediting period dates across documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the validation material.

- Leakage treatment is not clearly quantified in the extracted record, and reversal risk is marked as not addressed.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test and the VVB is identified as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification). No material findings were reported, which supports the core project case. However, permanence is weakly documented because reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is stated, while leakage treatment is not clearly quantified in the extracted record.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

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

- The monitoring report lists multiple missing documents and incomplete ER-sheet details, reducing traceability.

The project has a named verifier and a monitoring period from 2011-10-01 to 2016-03-27, which helps traceability. But the monitoring report also lists many missing items, including feeder-wise details, breakdown details, technical specification, PPA, no double counting declaration, and local stakeholder consultation documents. That level of incompleteness lowers confidence in the public record and MRV clarity.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of dual-claim risk.

- The verified emissions reduction figure differs from the claimed figure, and leakage justification changed across reports.

Claim safety is weakened by the gap between the claimed emissions reductions and the verified amount, with 60,149 claimed versus 75,948 verified in the extracted record. The leakage justification also appears inconsistent across documents, shifting from deemed negligible in an earlier report to quantified in the later monitoring report. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but CCP status is not stated.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

+ The extraction drew on multiple official documents, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records.

- The monitoring report records numerous corrective actions and missing evidence, including local stakeholder consultation documents and no double counting declaration.

Documentation quality is mixed: multiple official documents were used and extraction confidence is high, but the monitoring report still records many corrective actions and missing supporting files. The record also notes a mismatch in crediting period dates, which suggests internal consistency issues. Because the evidence set is broad but incomplete, the documentation score remains moderate rather than strong.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	Partial safeguards documentation
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unstated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the missing supporting documents, especially the PPA, technical specifications, no double counting declaration, and local stakeholder consultation records.

→ Clarify and reconcile the emissions reduction, leakage, and crediting period discrepancies across the validation, monitoring, and issuance documents.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-818D0926 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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