

QUALITY REPORT

Wind Power Project in Tinwari, Rajasthan

GS-1047 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-090C9122 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| 5.7 Overall Score out of 10 | ■ Integrity (35%) | 6.2 |
| | ■ Transparency (25%) | 5.4 |
| | ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 5.8 |
| | ■ Documentation (15%) | 5.1 |

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

Assessment Summary

This is a wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a project baseline, but the evidence record has several unresolved documentation gaps. The main weaknesses are missing or not stated leakage justification, no buffer pool information, and multiple corrective actions in the verification report, which reduce confidence in the robustness of the claims.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Registry | Gold Standard |
| Registry ID | GS-1047 |
| Sector | renewable_energy |
| Country | India |
| Vintage | Aging |
| Project Methodology | ACM0002 17.0 |
| Crediting Period | 2016 — 2022 |
| VVB | Earthood Services Private Limited |
| Verified ERs | 36,189 tCO2e |
| Monitoring Period | 2021 — 2022 |
| Confidence | High |
| Documents Reviewed | 20 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-19 |

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is not clearly justified in the latest verification record, even though an earlier document reportedly quantified it.
- The verification report lists multiple corrective actions and closes them, indicating the monitoring package needed several fixes before acceptance.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + The verification report from Earthood Services Private Limited confirms additionality through an investment test.
- Leakage justification is not addressed in the latest verification report, and buffer pool coverage is not stated.

The verification report from Earthood Services Private Limited confirms additionality using an investment test, which supports the project's core integrity case. However, the latest record does not address leakage justification, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and reversal handling is described only as not addressed, which weakens permanence and leakage confidence. The report also lists multiple corrective actions and closed findings, suggesting the monitoring evidence required several rounds of correction before acceptance.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

- + The monitoring period and verified emission reductions are stated in the verification report, with 36,189 verified ERs.
- Total claimed ERs, usage monitoring details, and several key baseline and grid-factor inputs are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is moderate because the verification report provides a monitoring period and a verified emissions figure of 36,189, but the claimed amount is not found in the extracted record. Key MRV details such as usage monitoring method, baseline reassessment timing, and several grid-factor inputs are missing, which limits public traceability. The medium extraction confidence also suggests at least one source was not fully readable.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

- + The project uses ACM0002 for a wind power activity, which is a standardised renewable-energy methodology.
- The record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, and the contradiction on leakage justification lowers confidence in over-crediting risk assessment.

Claim safety is helped by the use of ACM0002 for a wind project and by VVB-confirmed additionality, both of which reduce baseline manipulation risk. Still, the latest verification record does not clearly justify leakage treatment, and the contradiction notes that an earlier document reportedly quantified leakage while the newer record says it is not addressed. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + The record includes a recent verification report dated 2023-11-07 and indicates 18 documents were used.
- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the report contains several corrective actions and closed findings.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong: the record includes a recent verification report dated 2023-11-07 and 18 documents were used. At the same time, the extraction confidence is medium, and the report contains several corrective actions and clarifications, indicating the file set was not cleanly complete. The crediting period also appears in conflicting forms across documents, which further reduces documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| ● Additionality | VVB-confirmed investment test |
| ● Permanence | No reversal treatment stated |
| ● Leakage | Leakage not clearly justified |
| ● Baseline | Project baseline; reassessment missing |
| ● Safeguards | FPIC and grievance mechanism documented |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA/CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, document-linked leakage assessment and explain why the latest verification report differs from the earlier quantified leakage treatment.

→ Publish complete MRV support, including claimed versus verified ERs, baseline reassessment history, and explicit CORSIA/CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_monitoring period_19-03-2016 to 31-12-2018_v1-1.pdf
- 6004 Monitoring-Report_Clean.pdf
- (1)6004-Transition-Annex_(ver 2.0) Clean.docx
- MR-GS6004_v1.4_Clean 03 Nov 2023.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01-08-2017 to 31-12-2018_v1.3.pdf
- 6004_ER.xlsx
- GS6004 Annual Report.pdf
- Signed GS.VER.18.24_VCR.pdf
- 6004_4th MP_ER Sheet.xlsx
- GS Passport_04.11.2018_v3.pdf
- GS Passport_08.24.2017_v1.pdf
- TRF_GS6004_R2_SC_24012023.docx
- GS 6004 PDDv1.1_Clean 03 Nov 2023.pdf
- GS_6004_PDD.pdf
- PDD_07.23.2012_v5.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1047
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1047
- FVR 6004_Clean.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01-08-2017 to 31-12-2018_v2.pdf
- GS.VER.22.43_VCR_07112023_clean.pdf

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-090C9122 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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