QUALITY REPORT

Welspun Renewable Energy Program

CNN-0a20d0 · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-5B2146C2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	4.2
Transparency (25%)	6.0
Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has basic third-party assurance and a clear monitoring/crediting period, but key integrity elements (baseline approach, leakage treatment, and reassessment timing) are not evidenced in the extracted record. The verified ERs exceed the claimed ERs in the monitoring report, which raises over-crediting/QA concerns even though no material findings or corrective actions are reported.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-0a20d0
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2013
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12
Crediting Period	2013 — 2020
VVB	TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd
Verified ERs	283,819 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, despite being central to grid-connected renewable additionality and quantification.

■ Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, leaving an MRV gap even if leakage is expected to be low for this project type.

■ The monitoring report shows verified ERs (283,819) higher than claimed ERs (264,380), which is unusual and increases over-crediting/QA risk without further explanation.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality is stated as confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2022).

- Baseline method and leakage treatment are not evidenced in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2022).

The monitoring report (2022) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality at a high level. However, the baseline method is not stated in the extracted record, and there is no evidence of when (or whether) the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens confidence in baseline validity for a grid-connected renewable program. Leakage is explicitly not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record, leaving an integrity gap even if leakage is likely small for this sector.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ VVB is identified (TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd) and monitoring/crediting period is clearly stated (monitoring report, 2022).

- Key MRV inputs (baseline method, leakage deduction, grid EF vintage) are not stated in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2022).

The monitoring report (2022) provides a clear monitoring/crediting period (2013-03-31 to 2020-03-30) and identifies the VVB as TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd. A grid emission factor value is provided (0.9528), but the year/vintage of the grid EF is not stated in the extracted record, limiting reproducibility. The absence of stated baseline method and leakage deduction in the extracted record reduces MRV transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

- Verified ERs exceed claimed ERs (283,819 vs 264,380) in the monitoring report (2022), increasing QA/over-crediting concern.

~ CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence for downstream claims (available documents).

A key concern is that the monitoring report (2022) shows total verified ERs (283,819) higher than total claimed ERs (264,380); without an explanation, this is atypical and increases the risk of misunderstanding or misreporting in public claims. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess whether credits might be used across multiple claim channels. Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, which also increases the risk of overstated net climate benefit in marketing claims.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ Two core documents are available (validation report and monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- Safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are not documented in the extracted record (available documents).

The extracted record includes two core document types (validation report and monitoring report) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting basic document reliability. The monitoring report is dated 2022-09-26 and covers the 2013–2020 period, which is reasonably complete for that interval. However, safeguards-related elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit-sharing, and safeguards mention) are not evidenced in the extracted record, reducing documentation completeness for non-carbon aspects.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality stated
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversal risk evidenced
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed; no deduction stated
● **Baseline**	Baseline approach not evidenced in extracted record
● **Safeguards**	No FPIC/grievance mechanism evidenced
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach used (including grid EF vintage/source and any baseline reassessment) and provide enough detail for third-party reproduction of ER calculations.

→ Provide an explicit leakage assessment (even if concluded negligible) and state any leakage deduction applied.

→ Clarify why verified ERs exceed claimed ERs in the monitoring report and publish a reconciliation note or corrected summary table.

Documents Reviewed

- POA registration request form
- approval
- 31 Mar 2013 - 30 Mar 2020
- POA design document
- Validation report

Report ID: CM-5B2146C2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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