

QUALITY REPORT

AES Saurashtra Windfarms

VCS-1039 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-73FF9113 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported, which supports a moderate integrity profile. However, several key items are either not stated or inconsistent across documents, including crediting period dates, leakage treatment, and reported emission reductions, which weakens confidence in the claim quality.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1039
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.3.0
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A.(Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	411,162 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The extracted record shows large contradictions in reported emission reductions between validation documents, including a much higher verified and claimed total in the later report.
- Leakage is described as negligible in the monitoring report, but the validation report says it was not addressed, and the crediting period dates also conflict across documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the validation report.

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, and reversal risk is not addressed beyond an unspecified statement that reversals were not reported.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test, and the VVB is identified as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification). The monitoring report reports no material findings, but it also flags missing supporting evidence for equipment details, breakdown records, and site practice documentation, which weakens the robustness of the project file. Leakage is described as deemed negligible in the monitoring report, yet the validation report says it was not addressed, so the integrity score is held to a moderate level.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB and multiple official documents in the extracted record, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials.

- Several operational details are not stated in available documents, including the monitoring method for usage and the year for the grid emission factor.

The project has a reasonably broad document set, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and the monitoring period is clearly stated. Still, several transparency-relevant fields are not stated in available documents, including the usage monitoring method and the year for the grid emission factor. The record also shows that the crediting period was described differently in different documents, which reduces clarity.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of dual-claim risk.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and the record contains major contradictions in reported emission reductions across validation documents.

Claim safety is helped by the fact that the project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, lowering dual-market risk. On the other hand, the baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized or jurisdictional approach, and the record contains large contradictions in reported emission reductions between validation documents. Because the later validation report is more recent, it is privileged for the emission totals, but the inconsistency still raises over-crediting and reliability concerns.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

+ The extraction draws on 17 documents and the extraction confidence is high.

- The monitoring report itself lists multiple corrective actions, including missing technical equipment evidence, missing breakdown support, and a need to clarify the crediting period.

Documentation quality is decent because the extraction used 17 documents and the extraction confidence is high. The project also has a named VVB and a monitoring report with detailed findings. However, the monitoring report lists several corrective actions, including missing technical evidence and unresolved clarification on the crediting period, which prevents a higher score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● Leakage	Negligible claim, but inconsistent documentation
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions statement that explains the differences between the validation reports and clearly identifies the authoritative figure.

→ Submit missing operational evidence, including equipment specifications, O&M; agreements, breakdown support, and a clear, consistent crediting period record.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-73FF9113 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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