

QUALITY REPORT

21 MW Wind Energy Project by Shree Cement Limited

GS-1454 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-2E7C3270 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.7
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.3

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

Assessment Summary

This is a real renewable project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated project baseline, but the documentation shows several unresolved quality issues. The monitoring report flags missing supporting evidence for the second crediting period, inconsistent SDG reporting, and unclear treatment of leakage and reversal risk, which weakens confidence in the claimed credits.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1454
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 20.0
Crediting Period	2018 — 2023
VVB	TUV SUD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Verified ERs	45,880 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2025
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- The monitoring report says the validity of the baseline and data for the second crediting period is not demonstrated and asks for revisions.
- Several material findings remain unresolved, including missing JMRs, calibration certificates, and grievance register evidence.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports the project's core eligibility claim.
- The monitoring report says the baseline validity and data for the second crediting period are not demonstrated, and leakage is only described as deemed negligible without a quantified deduction.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the VVB confirmed additionality through an investment test, and the baseline method is stated as project-based. However, the monitoring report says the validity of the baseline and data/parameters for the second crediting period is not demonstrated, and it requests revisions and supporting evidence. Leakage is only described as deemed negligible, with no quantified deduction, and reversal risk is not clearly addressed.

Transparency — 4.7 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a verified emissions result of 45,880 tCO₂e in the monitoring report.
- The extracted record does not state the total claimed emissions reductions, and key MRV details such as usage monitoring and grid factor inputs are not found.

Transparency is mixed. The record identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, and a verified emissions reduction figure of 45,880 tCO₂e, which helps traceability. But the total claimed reductions are not found in the extracted record, and important MRV inputs such as usage monitoring method, usage rates, and grid emission factor details are missing.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

- + The project uses ACM0002 for wind power and the monitoring report treats leakage as negligible, which is directionally consistent for this project type.
- The validation and monitoring materials contain contradictions on the crediting period and additionality test framing, and the baseline was not shown to be freshly reassessed in a way that resolves those discrepancies.

Claim safety is moderate but not strong. The project is a wind project under ACM0002, which is generally lower risk than many land-use categories, and leakage is described as negligible. Still, the documentation contains contradictions around the crediting period and the additionality test framing, and the baseline reassessment does not fully resolve the concerns raised in the monitoring report.

Documentation — 4.3 / 10

- + Multiple document types were available, including a validation report, PDD, and monitoring report, and the extraction confidence is not low.
- The monitoring report lists several corrective actions, including missing invoices/JMRs, meter calibration certificates, and grievance register evidence, indicating incomplete documentation.

Documentation quality is limited by several unresolved findings in the monitoring report, including missing JMRs, calibration certificates, and grievance register evidence. The extraction confidence is medium rather than low, so the issue is not unreadability but substantive incompleteness. The presence of multiple document types helps, but the record still leaves important gaps in support for the second crediting period.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal treatment clearly documented
● Leakage	Negligible leakage claimed without quantification
● Baseline	Project baseline with reassessment concerns
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present, but safeguards not ful
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled crediting-period timeline and a clear explanation of why the monitoring and validation documents differ.

→ Submit the missing JMRs, meter calibration certificates, grievance register, and a quantified leakage and baseline reassessment package for the second crediting period.

Documents Reviewed

- MR V02 Shree Cements.pdf
- MR_GS6999 (MP3) v05 SM rev 08032024 cc.pdf
- GS4GG 6999 -Monitoring-Report _Shree Cement 21 MW Wind Project v02 08102021 - Clean.pdf
- GS 6999_Project-Annual-Report.pdf
- Annual Report _GS 6999 (20122022).pdf
- 01_2019_GS6999-10318 APPLUS_cleanmode.pdf
- GS 6999 PDD _RCP v06.1Design Review R2 (17 July) clean.pdf
- GS4GG_PDD_Shree Cements_V04_cleanmode.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1454
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1454
- GS6999_RCP_validation report_final 17072024 clean copy_06112024.pdf
- GS4GG_FVR_GS 6999 - cc.pdf
- FVR-GS 6999.pdf
- GS4GG_FVR_GS 6999_TQC 5621.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-2E7C3270 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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