

QUALITY REPORT

Bundled Wind Power Project In Jamnagar, Gujarat

VCS-1079 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-4E41E8FD · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This wind project has some positive integrity signals, including a VVB-confirmed investment test and no material findings in the monitoring report. However, several corrective actions were still required, leakage was not addressed, and key documentation contains contradictions on credited volumes and the crediting period, which weakens confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1079
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D Version 16
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Verified ERs	13,123 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2011
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The monitoring report required multiple corrective actions, including issues with the investment analysis and project documentation.
- Credited and verified emission reductions conflict across documents, and the project's crediting period also differs between monitoring reports.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality was tested through an investment analysis and confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring report.

- Leakage was set at 0% but the justification was not addressed, and reversal risk was not addressed in the extracted record.

The monitoring report shows an investment test for additionality and says the VVB, Bureau Veritas Certification, confirmed it, which supports the project's core eligibility case. At the same time, the report lists several corrective actions, including issues with the investment analysis and PDD references, and leakage was assigned a 0% deduction without any justification. Reversal risk is not meaningfully discussed in the extracted record, so permanence confidence is only moderate for an avoidance project.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and matching claimed and verified emission reductions in the latest extracted figures.

- The monitoring record does not state a usage monitoring method, and the extracted documents contain contradictions on reported emission reductions and the crediting period.

The project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and the latest extracted figures show claimed and verified emission reductions both at 13,123 tCO₂e. However, the monitoring record does not state a usage monitoring method, and the extracted documents contain contradictions on emission reduction totals and the crediting period. Those inconsistencies reduce transparency because it is harder to reconcile which figures should be relied on.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

+ The project is an avoidance project under a renewable energy methodology, which generally lowers reversal risk compared with removal projects.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and leakage treatment is not justified despite a 0% deduction.

Claim safety is weakened by the project-specific baseline and the lack of a clear leakage justification, even though the project is a wind avoidance activity under AMS-I.D. The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-market concern, but there is no CCP status available. Because the record shows unresolved methodological and reporting issues, over-crediting risk cannot be ruled out confidently.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and extraction confidence was high.

- Several corrective actions were required, and the record shows inconsistencies between documents on title, credited volumes, safeguards, and crediting period.

Documentation breadth is decent because the extracted record includes validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report required multiple corrective actions, and the documents conflict on project title, credited volumes, safeguards, and crediting period. Those contradictions suggest the file is usable but not fully clean or internally consistent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project, reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	0% deduction without justification
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	No FPIC or grievance mechanism found
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; no CCP approval stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, documented justification for the zero leakage deduction and explicitly address reversal/permanence treatment in the monitoring evidence.

→ Resolve the document inconsistencies on credited volumes, crediting period, project title, and safeguards, and publish a clean reconciled audit trail.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification 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-4E41E8FD · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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