

QUALITY REPORT

The Giving Trees

VCS-001 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-D13B3100 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a wind power project with VVB-confirmed additionality, but key integrity elements are weakly evidenced in the extracted record. Leakage is not addressed, baseline is project-specific with no reassessment date found, and there are material inconsistencies across documents (including the crediting period). Overall, the project appears moderately documented but carries elevated over-crediting and reliability risk due to gaps and contradictions.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-001
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D 10
Crediting Period	2006 — 2007
VVB	SGS United Kingdom Ltd
Verified ERs	21,704 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2006 — 2007
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Crediting period is contradictory between the PDD (2007-08-01—2014-07-31) and the validation/monitoring record (2006-04-01—2007-10-20), raising concerns about what period the verified ERs actually cover.
- Leakage is explicitly not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, despite being a key accounting element that should be justified even if deemed negligible.
- Safeguards and stakeholder process documentation is inconsistent, and corrective actions request clarification of local stakeholders and a host country approval letter.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification record) using an investment test.

- Baseline is project-specific and the baseline reassessment timing and leakage treatment are not evidenced in the extracted record (monitoring/validation set).

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports additionality robustness. However, the baseline is project-specific and no baseline reassessment date is found in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline validity over time. Leakage is explicitly not addressed in the monitoring/validation set and no leakage deduction is stated, creating an integrity gap even if leakage is expected to be low for wind projects.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ Independent VVB is identified (SGS United Kingdom Ltd) and a defined monitoring period is provided (2006-04-01—2007-10-20).

- Claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record and key MRV parameters (e.g., grid EF vintage year) are not stated, limiting reproducibility.

The monitoring period is clearly stated (2006-04-01—2007-10-20) and the VVB is named (SGS United Kingdom Ltd), which supports traceability. However, the total claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record, preventing a claimed-versus-verified cross-check. Key MRV details such as the grid emission factor vintage year are not stated, reducing the ability for third parties to reproduce calculations.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing one pathway for double-claiming concerns.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated because leakage is not addressed and core inputs/periodization are inconsistent across documents.

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of dual-channel claims through CORSIA. Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened by the lack of leakage treatment and by inconsistencies across documents that could affect the interpretation of what was credited and for which period. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on an external quality label to reduce greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- Corrective actions were required (DNA approval letter; stakeholder clarification), indicating documentation/eligibility gaps at the time of review.

The extracted record includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, and the extraction confidence is high, supporting a moderate documentation score. However, the review process listed corrective actions requiring a host country approval letter and clarification of which government departments were considered local stakeholders, indicating incomplete or unclear documentation at the time. Safeguards-related elements (FPIC and grievance mechanism) are not evidenced, and benefit sharing is not described.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Non-land-use project; reversal risk not material
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed; no deduction stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not evidenced
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance not evidenced; safeguards inconsistent
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; no CCP status stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/locate the ER calculation annex showing claimed vs verified ERs, grid emission factor vintage year, and any uncertainty/QA-QC checks for the monitoring period.

→ Provide a clear leakage assessment (even if negligible) and reconcile the crediting period discrepancy across the PDD, validation report, and monitoring report with an explicit registry/issuance timeline.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation

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-D13B3100 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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