

QUALITY REPORT

119.8 MW Natural Gas Based Combined Cycle Power Plant, At Tanjavur, Tamilnadu By M/S Aban Power Company Limited

VCS-68 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-A7559C53 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
■ Transparency (25%)	6.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS power project has VVB-confirmed additionality and matching claimed vs verified emission reductions for the monitored period, which supports basic credibility. However, the extracted record shows important gaps around baseline reassessment, grid emission factor disclosure, and leakage deduction quantification, and the monitoring report lists numerous corrective actions that point to MRV and reporting quality weaknesses.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-68
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	2010
Project Methodology	AM0029 01.1
Crediting Period	2005 — 2015
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	1,354,428 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2015
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including missing ex-ante baseline/project/leakage calculations and missing conservativeness rounding application, indicating MRV/reporting weaknesses.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment and the grid emission factor inputs are not found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the leakage deduction percentage and key baseline inputs (e.g., grid emission factor) are not found in the extracted record.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (Earthood Services Private Limited), which supports additionality robustness. The baseline is described as project-specific, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens confidence that baseline assumptions remained appropriate over time. Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to judge conservativeness.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

- + Claimed and verified emission reductions match (1,354,428 tCO₂e) for the stated monitoring period in the monitoring/verification record.
- The monitoring report includes several documentation and calculation-related corrective actions, reducing confidence in MRV clarity and completeness.

For the monitoring period 2010-12-16 to 2015-08-10, the monitoring/verification record shows the same total emission reductions claimed and verified (1,354,428 tCO₂e), which is a positive signal for MRV consistency. However, the monitoring report (2021-09-20) lists multiple corrective actions (e.g., missing ex-ante emissions calculations in the MR and missing conservativeness rounding application in the ER sheet), which reduces transparency and auditability of the calculations from the extracted record. Key quantitative inputs such as the grid emission factor year/value are not found in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + No material findings were reported in the extracted verification outcomes.
- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, and the monitoring report requested a declaration to avoid double counting (including India REC), elevating claims risk.

Over-crediting risk is moderately elevated because the baseline is project-specific and key baseline inputs (including the grid emission factor) are not found in the extracted record, making independent reasonableness checks difficult. The monitoring report includes a corrective action requesting a declaration to avoid double counting with other GHG programs and India's REC mechanism, indicating this risk needed explicit mitigation at the time of review. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so downstream claims compatibility cannot be confirmed from the extracted record.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

- + Multiple official document types were used (monitoring report and validation report) with high extraction confidence.
- Numerous corrective actions in the monitoring report indicate incomplete/incorrect reporting elements at the time of assessment.

The extracted package includes a monitoring report and validation report (plus an additional unidentified document type), with four documents used and high extraction confidence, supporting a mid-to-good documentation score. Nonetheless, the monitoring report (2021-09-20) contains numerous corrective actions related to formatting, missing location evidence, incomplete sections, and missing calculation elements, indicating the documentation set was not fully compliant/complete at the time assessed. Several important fields (e.g., baseline reassessment timing, leakage deduction percentage, grid emission factor details) are not found in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal risk indicated for this project type
● Leakage	Quantified in narrative, but deduction not evidenced
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards and grievance noted; FPIC not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated; double-counting declaration requested

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and clearly document baseline inputs (grid emission factor value/year and calculation approach) and any baseline reassessment evidence for the monitoring period.

→ Provide the quantified leakage deduction (percentage and calculation) and close all monitoring report corrective actions, including conservativeness rounding and complete ex-ante emissions calculation sections.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Verification Report
- Verification 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-A7559C53 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy