

QUALITY REPORT

IND/REC/WND/VER/03012026/00021

OG-6958c11c · VCS · India Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-B1C8BBFE · 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 beyond basic metadata, so core quality questions (additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV) cannot be validated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak substantiation is high from an analyst perspective.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-6958c11c
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 monitoring.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or misread critical details.

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 labeled as renewable energy avoidance, but without a PDD/monitoring/verification report the baseline and additionality cannot be assessed.

No PDD, monitoring report, or verification report was captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any permanence-related provisions (if applicable) are not stated in available documents. Because the project is renewable energy avoidance, the integrity assessment hinges on baseline and grid emission factor treatment, but these are not available here. With these evidence gaps, integrity is scored very low and conservatively.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed ER information was found in the extracted record.

- Registry/public disclosure completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

The extracted record does not include the VVB name, monitoring period, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions, so MRV transparency cannot be evaluated. No evidence documents were captured, so public disclosure and registry completeness cannot be confirmed from the extracted record. Transparency is therefore scored very low.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record, increasing greenwashing and eligibility ambiguity.

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline and monitoring methods were not found in the extracted record.

CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on documented eligibility signals to reduce greenwashing risk. Baseline and monitoring details (including any grid factor approach) are also not available, preventing an over-crediting risk screen. Claim safety is scored low due to these unresolved uncertainties.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used/captured in the extracted record, indicating severe evidence gaps.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/ingestion issues that undermine reliability.

The extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence document list, indicating that the underlying project documentation was not available for assessment. Minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the chance that critical information was missed. Documentation is scored extremely low; note that a documentation score below 3.0 would trigger a transparency cap under the stated gate rules.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide and link the full VCS project documentation set (PDD, monitoring report(s), verification report(s), and issuance/registry records) so baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV can be validated.
- Publish key quantified parameters and results (monitoring period, claimed vs verified ERs, grid emission factor/baseline approach, leakage assessment, and any findings/corrective actions) in a machine-readable summary to reduce ambiguity.

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-B1C8BBFE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy