

QUALITY REPORT

Wind Power Project In Maharashtra State, India

VCS-1693 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-6F2C5856 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	3.1
	Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%	

Assessment Summary

This wind project has some strengths: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, no reversal events were reported, and the issuance record shows no material findings. However, the documentation is incomplete in several important areas, with missing leakage details, no buffer pool information, and multiple corrective actions that point to unresolved quality issues.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1693
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D. 17.0
Crediting Period	2013 — 2015
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+)
Verified ERs	27,582 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2015
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- Several corrective actions were still required, including host-country approval, prior-consideration clarification, and billing/apportionment details.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, and key transparency fields such as claimed emissions reductions and usage monitoring are not stated.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports the project's core crediting case.
- No buffer pool percentage is stated, and the issuance record still lists multiple corrective actions, including host-country approval and prior-consideration issues.

The VVB confirmed additionality through an investment test, which is a meaningful positive for integrity. The project reports no reversal events, and the issuance record lists no material findings. That said, there is no buffer pool percentage in the extracted record, and the project still had multiple corrective actions outstanding, including host-country approval and prior-consideration clarification, which weakens confidence in the overall crediting case.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The monitoring and crediting period are clearly stated, and the VVB is identified as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+).
- Claimed emissions reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and the usage monitoring method is also not found.

The monitoring and crediting period are clearly identified, and the verifier is named as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+). However, the extracted record does not state claimed emissions reductions or the usage monitoring method, which limits public traceability. The low extraction confidence also suggests at least one key source was difficult to read, reducing documentation clarity.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + The project is an avoidance project under a project-specific baseline, which is generally more straightforward than removal-credit claims.
- Leakage justification is inconsistent across documents, and key over-crediting checks such as verified usage rates and jurisdictional factors are not available.

This is an avoidance project with a project-specific baseline, but the baseline was not shown to have been recently reassessed. Leakage treatment is not cleanly documented: one part of the record says leakage justification was quantified, while another earlier document said it was not addressed. With no verified usage rates, no FNRB value, and no CORSIA or CCP status stated, over-crediting and double-claim risk remain only partially assessed.

Documentation — 3.1 / 10

- + Eleven documents were used, and the issuance record reports no material findings.
- Extraction confidence is low, and the record shows several unresolved corrective actions plus at least one contradiction on safeguards and leakage treatment.

The record draws on eleven documents, which is a reasonable base, and the issuance report notes no material findings. Even so, extraction confidence is low, and several corrective actions remained open in the issuance record. The project dates are relatively old, and the documentation set does not provide several key quantitative fields needed for a stronger assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent in records
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned, but FPIC and grievance mechanism absent
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, internally consistent leakage assessment and clearly state the quantified deduction in the final issuance package.

→ Publish the missing transparency items, including claimed emissions reductions, usage monitoring details, and explicit host-country approval and anti-double-counting evidence.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation.pdf
- REG_PRR_1693_13OCT2017.pdf
- VCS Monitoring Report_Mahalaxmi_29082017.pdf
- Regn Representation.pdf
- COMMUNICATIONS AGREEMENT_Mahalaxmi.pdf
- VCS PD_V02_29082017.pdf
- mahalaxmi pdd 2504 clean mode.pdf
- 1917_VER_Deed_Representation.pdf
- 02_VCS_FVR_1917.pdf
- 1917_VAL_Deed_Representation.pdf
- Final Validation Report.pdf

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-6F2C5856 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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