

QUALITY REPORT

Renewable Energy Wind Power Project in Rajasthan, India

GS-875 · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-774DF098 · Generated: 2026-04-11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a Gold Standard wind project with VVB-confirmed investment-test additionality and no material findings reported, which supports moderate integrity. However, several key items are either not stated or contradictory across documents, including FPIC, grievance and safeguard details, and the credited emissions figures, which weakens confidence in the claim.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-875
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.3.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	72,048 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-11

Red Flags

- The credited emissions totals differ materially across documents, with the verification report and later record not matching the PDD.
- FPIC, grievance, safeguards, and benefit-sharing are inconsistently documented across reports, creating reliability concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, and the verification report reports no material findings.
- Leakage is only described as negligible with a 0% deduction, while reversal risk is marked as not addressed and no buffer pool is stated.

The verification report from Earthood Services Private Limited confirms additionality through an investment test and reports no material findings or corrective actions. Leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction, but reversal risk is not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is stated, which limits permanence confidence for a crediting project. The baseline is project-specific rather than recently reassessed, so the overall integrity case is solid but not strong.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a verification report with quantified issuance figures.
- Several core MRV items are not stated in available documents, including the usage monitoring method and whether the project is CORSIA-eligible.

The project has a named verifier, a clear monitoring period, and a verification report that discloses issuance figures, which supports basic transparency. At the same time, the usage monitoring method is not stated, CORSIA eligibility is not found in the extracted record, and several safeguard-related items are inconsistently reported across documents. These gaps reduce the completeness and auditability of the public record.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

- + The project uses ACM0002 and a project baseline, which is a recognized methodology for grid-connected renewable energy.
- The emissions figures are contradictory across documents, and the large gap between claimed and verified issuance raises over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is weakened by contradictory emissions totals: the verification report shows one verified amount, while another later extracted record shows a different verified total, and the PDD lists a much larger claimed amount. I privileged the verification report for issuance because it is the higher-priority assurance document, but the discrepancy still signals over-crediting or data-quality risk. The Gold Standard certification helps, yet the absence of clear CORSIA status and the inconsistent emissions figures keep the score moderate.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were available, including a verification report, monitoring report, PDD, and appendix, with 19 documents used overall.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and several safeguards-related items are inconsistent or not stated in the extracted record.

The evidence base is reasonably broad, with a monitoring report, PDD, appendix, and verification report all present, and 19 documents used in extraction. However, extraction confidence is only medium, and several fields are either not stated or contradictory, including FPIC, grievance handling, benefit sharing, and the credited emissions totals. The verification report is the most reliable source for issuance and assurance findings, but the mixed record lowers documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No buffer pool stated; reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Leakage deemed negligible with 0% deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline stated; reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	Safeguards and grievance mechanism present but inconsistentl
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled emissions statement that explains the differences between the PDD, monitoring report, and verification report figures.

→ Provide a complete safeguards and MRV package covering FPIC, grievance handling, usage monitoring, and any buffer or reversal treatment.

Documents Reviewed

- UN 5090_MR VER-01.3.doc
- GS.VER.20.20_GS5007_VCR.pdf
- Monitoring Report_6th monitoring period_01.09.2017 to 31.12.2018_v1.1.pdf
- MR_5007_Clean.pdf
- Monitoring Report_6th monitoring period_01.09.2017 to 31.12.2018_v1.1 (2).pdf
- GS MR version 1.3.docx
- (1)Monitoring Report_6th monitoring period_01.09.2017 to 31.12.2018_v1.1 (2).pdf
- 5007-ER Sheet(2).xlsx
- DEV_399(Revised).pdf
- (1)5007-Transition-Annex (ver 2.0)- Clean.docx
- GS Passport_14-12-16.pdf
- GS Passport_12-12-2011.pdf
- PDD_08-07-14.pdf
- PDD_10-02-2012.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-875
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-875
- Verification Report_6th monitoring period_01.09.2017 to 31.12.2018_v6.pdf
- GS.VER.22.44_GS5007_VCR - Clean(1).pdf
- Verification Report_6th monitoring period_01.09.2017 to 31.12.2018_v1.PDF
- (1)Verification Report_6th monitoring period_01.09.2017 to 31.12.2018_v6.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-774DF098 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-11 · Generated: 2026-04-11

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