

QUALITY REPORT

# Wind power project in Maharashtra by TVS Energy Limite...

CNN-3d639a · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-70DE6A1A · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>5.0</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.6</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.1</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.2</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has a VVB-confirmed investment additionality assessment and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the available validation record. However, key integrity elements (baseline reassessment timing and leakage treatment) are missing or not addressed, and there is a material inconsistency between claimed and verified emission reductions that increases over-crediting risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-3d639a
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.3.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2019
VVB	Det Norske Veritas
Verified ERs	376,039 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Verified emission reductions (376,039) exceed claimed emission reductions (338,666), indicating a reporting inconsistency that should be reconciled before relying on the numbers.
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record.
- Safeguards documentation is inconsistent across documents, and FPIC and a grievance mechanism are stated as not present.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.6 / 10

- + The validation report confirms additionality using an investment test and was validated by Det Norske Veritas.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated; leakage is not addressed in the extracted record.

The validation report (2012-12-03) indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and validated by Det Norske Veritas, which supports additionality robustness. The baseline is described as project-specific and uses ACM0002 (v12.3.0), but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, weakening confidence that baseline parameters remained appropriate over time. Leakage is explicitly noted as not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, which is a notable integrity gap even for grid-connected wind where leakage is often argued negligible but should still be justified in the monitoring/verification narrative.

### Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + A named VVB (Det Norske Veritas) and a clearly stated monitoring/crediting period (2012-12-20 to 2019-12-19) are provided.
- The extracted record shows a mismatch between claimed and verified ERs, and several MRV-relevant fields (e.g., grid EF vintage, leakage deduction) are not stated.

The extracted record provides a clear monitoring/crediting period (2012-12-20 — 2019-12-19) and identifies the VVB (Det Norske Veritas) in the validation report (2012-12-03). However, the total emission reductions show an internal inconsistency (claimed 338,666 vs verified 376,039) that is not explained in the extracted record, reducing transparency of the MRV trail. Several fields that would normally help users interpret the calculation (e.g., grid emission factor vintage/year and leakage deduction) are not stated in the available extracted data.

### Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- The ER mismatch (verified higher than claimed) raises data reliability and over-crediting/claims risk unless explained in the verification/issuance context.
- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the available documents, increasing uncertainty around downstream claims and eligibility.

The discrepancy where verified ERs exceed claimed ERs (376,039 vs 338,666) increases the risk that third parties misunderstand what was actually issued/eligible, and it should be reconciled against the verification statement and registry issuance records before making public claims. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess whether credits might be used in multiple claim contexts. The baseline is project-specific, and without a stated baseline reassessment date and leakage justification, there is elevated uncertainty around conservativeness.

### Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + Multiple document types are referenced (PDD and validation report) and extraction confidence is medium.
- Key items are missing or inconsistent (safeguards contradiction; baseline reassessment and leakage quantification not found in the extracted record).

The evidence set includes a PDD and a validation report, with six documents used overall and medium extraction confidence, suggesting a moderate documentation base. Still, important elements are missing in the extracted record (baseline reassessment timing, leakage deduction/justification details, and several monitoring-method fields). The record also indicates FPIC was not conducted and no grievance mechanism is present, and safeguards documentation is inconsistent across sources, which reduces confidence in completeness.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	No FPIC or grievance mechanism; inconsistent safeguards disclosure
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verification/issuance documentation that reconciles the claimed vs verified ER totals and clearly links to registry issuance/retirement records.

→ Add explicit leakage assessment/justification (even if 0%) and disclose baseline parameter update/reassessment timing (including grid EF vintage/year) for the monitoring period.

→ Document and implement a grievance mechanism and clarify safeguards/consultation evidence (including whether any stakeholder engagement equivalent to FPIC was conducted).

## Documents Reviewed

- registration request form
- Appendix 1 - 8551-CER sheet-4 Dec 12
- 20 Dec 2012 - 19 Dec 2019
- approval
- Appendix 2 - 8551-Financial analysis Sheet-4 Dec 12
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- project design document
- 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-70DE6A1A · 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)