

QUALITY REPORT

IND/REC/WND/VER/18072025/00006

OG-687a24ea · VCS · India Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-B72F32CC · 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-specific information from official documents, and the minimum extraction confidence is low. With no evidence on baseline setting, additionality, monitoring, leakage, or verification outcomes, the project cannot be assessed as high-quality on any dimension.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-687a24ea
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No official documents were successfully used in extraction (0 documents), creating a major evidence gap across baseline, additionality, MRV, and findings.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or misinterpreted information.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- No extracted evidence on additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, or verification findings from official documents.

~ Project is labeled as renewable energy avoidance, but project-type alone is insufficient to judge additionality or baseline validity.

No project documents were captured in the extracted record (no evidence documents; 0 documents used), so additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage treatment, and any verification findings are not stated in available documents. Because these are core integrity elements, the score is heavily penalized. The project being categorized as renewable energy avoidance does not substitute for documented additionality and baseline validity.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (periods, VVB, ERR checks) were found in the extracted record.

- Registry/documentation completeness cannot be confirmed because no evidence documents were captured.

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record contains no monitoring or verification information (no VVB name, monitoring period, or cross-check of claimed vs verified emission reductions). With no documents available, it is not possible to confirm MRV procedures or registry completeness beyond the provided registry code. Low extraction confidence further increases uncertainty that key disclosures were missed.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- No extracted evidence on over-crediting controls (baseline method, grid factors, leakage justification) or eligibility statuses (CCP/CORSIA).

~ Absence of contradictions helps, but it is outweighed by the lack of underlying data.

Claim safety is low due to the absence of extracted evidence on baseline setting, grid emission factors, leakage justification, or any checks against over-crediting. Eligibility indicators relevant to marketing claims (such as CCP status or CORSIA eligibility) are not stated in available documents. With no underlying documentation, the risk of unsupported claims remains high.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents listed as evidence and zero documents used for extraction.

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing reliability of any missing/partial fields.

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key source was poorly readable, which undermines confidence in completeness. This warrants a very low documentation score.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide and extract the PDD, monitoring report(s), and verification report(s) so baseline method, additionality test, leakage treatment, and verified ERs can be assessed.
- Improve document readability/scan quality (to raise extraction confidence) and include explicit statements on VVB, monitoring period, material findings/corrective actions, and any CCP/CORSIA eligibility.

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-B72F32CC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy