

## QUALITY REPORT

# Combined Cycle Natural Gas Based Grid Connected Power Plant At Jegurupadu, India

VCS-982 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-67C37605 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 6.4

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.4
■ Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has a reasonably solid integrity case for a VCS grid-connected power project, with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no material findings or corrective actions reported. However, key quantifications that affect crediting risk (notably the claimed ERs, leakage deduction percentage, and grid emission factor details) were not found in the extracted record, and safeguards information is inconsistent across documents.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-982
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	2010
Project Methodology	AM0029 3.0
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	Perry Johnson Registrar Carbon Emissions Services, Inc
Verified ERs	1,407,860 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2011
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Safeguards disclosure is contradictory between the PDD and the monitoring report, raising reliability concerns for social/environmental risk reporting.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage was not found in the extracted record.
- The total emission reductions claimed were not found in the extracted record, limiting cross-checking against the verified figure.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment was not found in the extracted record.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record). The baseline approach is project-specific (PDD/monitoring documentation), and the timing of any baseline reassessment was not found in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline continued appropriateness. Leakage is described as quantified (monitoring report), but the actual leakage deduction percentage was not found in the extracted record, creating uncertainty about whether deductions were correctly applied.

### Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + The monitoring period (2009-04-14 to 2011-04-13) and verified ERs (1,407,860) are clearly stated in the monitoring/issuance record.
- Key MRV inputs (grid emission factor and year, and the project's claimed ERs) were not found in the extracted record, reducing auditability.

The monitoring report (dated 2013-06-19) clearly states the monitoring period (2009-04-14 to 2011-04-13), and the issuance/verification record provides verified emission reductions of 1,407,860. However, the total emission reductions claimed were not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to reconcile claimed vs verified values. Key parameters that typically enable replication (grid emission factor and the year of the grid EF) were also not found in the extracted record.

### Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.
- Over-crediting risk cannot be well screened because the grid emission factor and leakage deduction percentage were not found in the extracted record.

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of higher-stakes aviation claims being made from these credits. Nonetheless, over-crediting risk screening is constrained because the grid emission factor (and its vintage) was not found in the extracted record, and the leakage deduction percentage is also missing despite leakage being described as quantified in the monitoring report. CCP status was not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about how the credits might be marketed under newer integrity labels.

### Documentation — 7.4 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and no corrective actions reported.
- Safeguards reporting is inconsistent between documents, indicating a documentation quality/control issue.

The extracted record shows a reasonably complete document set (monitoring report, validation report, PDD, and issuance) and a high minimum extraction confidence, supporting a stronger documentation score. The monitoring report shows no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports document quality and audit outcomes. However, safeguards information is inconsistent between the PDD and the monitoring report, indicating a documentation control issue for non-carbon aspects.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal risk typical for grid power
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified but % not provided
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards not evidenced; inconsistent reporting
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the full baseline parameter set used for ER calculation (grid emission factor value, year/vintage, and data sources) and provide a clear reconciliation of claimed vs verified ERs for the monitoring period.

→ Provide consistent safeguards documentation across the PDD and monitoring/verification records (e.g., stakeholder consultation evidence, grievance mechanism, and any environmental/social management measures).

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- 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-67C37605 · 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)