

## QUALITY REPORT

# Wind Energy Project in Gujarat by Enn Enn Corp Limited

GS-2600 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-F752F7AA · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.0**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>3.8</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.2</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>3.9</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>4.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This wind project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, the record shows many corrective actions, weak leakage treatment, and several documentation gaps and contradictions that reduce confidence in the claimed reductions.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-2600
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D Version 17
Crediting Period	2019 — 2024
VVB	URS VERIFICATION PRIVATE LIMITED
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

## Red Flags

- The monitoring report lists many corrective actions and material findings, suggesting substantial documentation and compliance issues.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the monitoring report, while the older validation report treated it as negligible, creating a reliability concern.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 3.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by URS Verification Private Limited using an investment test, which is stronger than an unverified claim.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and the project uses a project baseline rather than a more robust standardized baseline.

The project's additionality was confirmed by the VVB through an investment test, which is a meaningful positive. On the negative side, the monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, reversal events are not addressed, and the baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized approach. The large number of material findings and corrective actions in the monitoring report further weakens confidence in the integrity of the credited reductions.

### Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the project identifies the verifier as URS Verification Private Limited.

- The extracted record does not provide verified or claimed emission reduction totals, and the monitoring report contains many corrective actions.

The monitoring period is clearly stated, the verifier is named as URS Verification Private Limited, and usage monitoring is described as smart-meter based. However, the extracted record does not include verified or claimed emission reduction totals, which limits public traceability of the credited volume. The monitoring report also contains many corrective actions, indicating that the documentation package was not fully clean.

### Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

+ The project is a wind renewable-energy activity with smart-meter-based usage monitoring, which supports basic MRV credibility.

- The monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, and the contradiction with the validation report's negligible-leakage view lowers confidence in over-crediting risk.

As a wind project, the activity type is inherently lower risk than many land-use projects, and smart-meter monitoring supports measurement quality. Even so, leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and the project relies on a project baseline rather than a more conservative standardized baseline. The contradiction between the monitoring report and the older validation report on leakage treatment increases over-crediting concern.

### Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ The record includes multiple official document types, and extraction confidence is high.

- The monitoring report lists numerous material findings and corrective actions, and the crediting-period dates conflict with the validation report.

The record draws on several official sources, including a monitoring report, validation report, PDD, and stakeholder consultation material, and extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report lists many corrective actions, and the crediting-period dates conflict between the monitoring report and validation report. That inconsistency, together with missing key quantitative fields, keeps documentation quality only moderate.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal treatment stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessed in 2021
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, reconciled emissions statement with verified and claimed reduction totals, plus a clear explanation of any discrepancies across documents.

→ Document leakage treatment, reversal risk management, and the basis for the crediting-period dates in a single consistent monitoring package.

## Documents Reviewed

- GS MR\_(GS\_7755)Ver.04 (Clean).pdf
- ER Sheet - (GS 7755)(1)(2).xlsx
- GS 7755\_V2.0-Annual-Report\_20231219.pdf
- Stakeholder Report (Revised).pdf
- ER Calculation-estimated(1).xlsx
- Stakeholder Report (Revised)(Version 02).pdf
- GS PDD (GS 7755) Ver.05 (Clean).pdf
- GS PDD (GS 7755) Ver.02.pdf
- GS PDD ID 10555 (Version 02).pdf
- CDM-PDD(10073).pdf
- PDD.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-2600
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-2600
- FVR-GS VER-ENN ENN corp GS 7755 TQC 6620-GS R2-clean.pdf
- CDM -Validation Report(10073).pdf
- FVR-GS VAL-ENN ENN corp GS 7755 TQC 6620.pdf
- FVR-GS VAL-ENN ENN corp GS 7755 TQC 6620\_GS R2\_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-F752F7AA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)