

QUALITY REPORT

Wind Power Project In Gujarat

VCS-1190 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-3E8B074F · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project is a grid-connected wind power activity under ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB, but several internal inconsistencies across reports weaken confidence in the quantified results. Leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction in the latest monitoring, yet earlier monitoring did not address leakage, and multiple corrective actions indicate MRV and recordkeeping weaknesses.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1190
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2017, 2018
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.3.0
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	11,867 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	29 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large discrepancies across documents for claimed and verified emission reductions (e.g., claimed 84,173 vs 211,372; verified 11,867 vs 44,356), increasing over-crediting and reliability risk
- Extensive corrective actions in the monitoring/verification cycle (e.g., missing implementation/shutdown details, missing event logs affecting ERs, calibration non-compliance, incomplete monitoring report sections, and double-counting declarations requested)

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents; MRV weaknesses are indicated by numerous corrective actions in the monitoring report (2022).

The project applies ACM0002 with a project-specific baseline approach, and additionality is confirmed by the VVB per the extracted validation/verification record. However, the baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents, and the monitoring report (2022-07-19) lists many corrective actions (e.g., missing event logs impacting ERs, incomplete monitoring sections, and calibration frequency non-compliance), which weakens confidence in the robustness of quantified reductions. Leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction in the 2022 monitoring report, but earlier monitoring (2020-10-07) reportedly did not address leakage, creating uncertainty about consistent application over time.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ Key project attributes are identifiable (VCS registry, methodology ACM0002 v12.3.0, VVB named, monitoring period stated in the monitoring report dated 2022-07-19).

- Reported ER figures and some safeguard statements vary materially across documents, reducing traceability and confidence in the public record.

Core MRV metadata is present (VVB identified as LGAI Technological Center/Applus+, monitoring period 2021-06-01 to 2021-08-05, and grid emission factor 0.9528 in the extracted record). Transparency is reduced by material inconsistencies across documents in both claimed and verified ER totals, and by multiple template/recordkeeping corrections requested in the monitoring report (2022-07-19). The presence of repeated requests for supporting documents (JMRs/invoices, commissioning certificates, calibration certificates, and internal audit procedures) suggests the public-facing record may not be consistently complete or easily auditable.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing some downstream claim-risk exposure.

- Contradictory ER quantities across validation/monitoring documents and unresolved double-counting evidence requests elevate over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, which lowers the risk of certain high-stakes aviation claims. Nonetheless, over-crediting/claim risk is elevated because ER quantities differ substantially across documents (including differences between validation/monitoring figures), and the monitoring report (2022-07-19) includes requests for declarations and evidence to avoid double counting (including participation in other GHG programs and REC/CER considerations). CCP status is not stated in available documents, leaving uncertainty for CCP-aligned claims.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (24 documents including PDD, monitoring reports, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Numerous corrective actions requested (including double-counting declarations and monitoring parameter evidence) indicate documentation quality/control issues in the monitoring report (2022).

Documentation coverage is moderate-to-good in breadth (24 documents used; evidence includes PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance) and extraction confidence is high. Quality is weakened by the extensive list of corrective actions in the monitoring report (2022-07-19), including missing implementation/shutdown details, missing information on events affecting ERs, incomplete organizational/QA descriptions, and calibration compliance issues. These indicate that while documents exist, they may require significant remediation to be fully decision-grade.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal mechanism needed
● Leakage	0% leakage but inconsistently addressed across periods
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards reported recently but inconsistent historically
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation table across all monitoring/verification/issuance documents explaining differences in claimed vs verified ERs (by period, data source, and any corrections).

→ Provide complete, auditable evidence packs for monitoring parameters (including calibration certificates meeting the registered frequency, event logs affecting generation/ERs, internal audit procedures, and explicit double-counting/REC/CER declarations) and ensure consistent safeguards/grievance/FPIC documentation across reporting periods.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation 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-3E8B074F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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