

QUALITY REPORT

IND/REC/WND/GCC/18062025/00007

OG-68525803 · Gold Standard · India Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-19FE6C39 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality elements (baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring performance) cannot be validated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak substantiation is high based on evidence gaps alone.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	OG-68525803
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV claims
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or incorrect facts

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record due to missing documents

~ The project is described as renewable energy avoidance, but without documents the baseline and additionality cannot be assessed

No official documents were captured in the extracted record, so the baseline method, additionality test, leakage approach, and any buffer/reversal provisions were not stated in available documents. Because there is no verification/monitoring evidence in the record, it is not possible to confirm whether emission reductions are additional or conservatively quantified. Given these evidence gaps, integrity is scored very low by default.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed ER figures were found in the extracted record

- Registry/documentation completeness cannot be checked because no evidence documents were provided

The extracted record includes no evidence documents and does not provide a VVB name, monitoring period, or any claimed-versus-verified emission reduction figures. With no monitoring/verification reports available, MRV quality and registry completeness cannot be assessed. Transparency is therefore scored very low.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, leakage justification, and any usage/operational monitoring details were not found

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, so double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be ruled out

Without baseline and leakage documentation, the risk of over-crediting cannot be evaluated and must be treated conservatively. Eligibility indicators relevant to double-claim risk (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record. As a result, the project is not safe to claim against based on the available evidence.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, leaving the assessment unsupported by primary sources

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues and reduces reliability

No documents were used in the extraction (0 total), and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable. This combination implies major documentation incompleteness and unreliable extraction. Documentation is scored near the floor.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Avoidance type but permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	No baseline method found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports (including VVB opinion) so baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV can be validated

→ Provide registry and eligibility evidence (issuance/retirement records, CORSIA/CCP status, and any corresponding adjustment statements if relevant) to reduce double-claim and greenwashing risk

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-19FE6C39 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy