

QUALITY REPORT

MRMPL Wind Power Project

VCS-1781 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-318A3664 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	3.3
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.7
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

This wind project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings, but the record also shows important reliability issues and unresolved documentation mismatches. The project is now withdrawn on the registry, and several key items such as leakage treatment, baseline reassessment, and usage monitoring are not clearly documented in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1781
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 10.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	21,792 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- Registry status: WITHDRAWN — project withdrawn from the registry (terminal)
- The extracted record contains multiple contradictions, including different credited periods and different verified emission reduction totals across documents.
- Corrective actions were required for mismatched crediting-period dates and methodology/tool versions, which weakens confidence in the reported figures.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.3 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which is a meaningful positive signal.
- Leakage treatment is not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and the baseline was project-specific with no reassessment date found.

The verification report identifies additionality through an investment test and says there were no material findings, which supports the project's core integrity. However, the extracted record does not clearly state a leakage deduction, buffer pool contribution, or baseline reassessment date, so several permanence and baseline controls remain weakly evidenced. The project is an avoidance wind project, so reversal risk is inherently lower than for removals, but the documentation gaps still matter.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The monitoring period and verified emission reductions are stated, and the VVB is identified as TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd.
- Several core MRV details are not stated in available documents, including usage monitoring method and baseline reassessment timing.

The monitoring period, VVB name, and verified emission reductions are available, which helps basic traceability. At the same time, key MRV details are missing from the extracted record, including the usage monitoring method and any baseline reassessment timing. The registry status is withdrawn, which does not itself prove poor transparency, but it does reduce confidence in the current public claim environment.

Claim Safety — 1.7 / 10

- + The project is an avoidance wind project, which generally lowers permanence risk compared with removal projects.
- Contradictory emission reduction totals and crediting-period dates create over-crediting and record-consistency concerns.

Claim safety is weakened by the contradictions in the extracted record, especially the different verified emission reduction totals and different crediting-period dates across documents. I privileged the later 2022 figures because they appear to come from the more recent verification material, but the presence of conflicting earlier values still raises over-crediting and record-consistency concerns. The project is not shown to be CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved in the extracted record, so there is no strong external quality endorsement to offset those issues.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

- + Eighteen documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- Corrective actions were required for date and methodology mismatches, and the evidence set includes several unresolved contradictions.

The record draws on 18 documents and the extraction confidence is medium, which is acceptable but not strong. Still, the verification material required corrective actions for mismatched crediting-period dates and methodology/tool versions, indicating documentation inconsistency. I privileged the more recent 2022 values over older 2018/2010 values because they are later and appear tied to the latest verification cycle, but the unresolved contradictions lower confidence overall.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance wind project
● Leakage	No clear quantified leakage treatment
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	Grievance mechanism present, FPIC not shown
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clean, reconciled verification trail that explains the differing crediting periods and emission reduction totals across documents.

→ Publish explicit leakage treatment, baseline reassessment history, and complete MRV procedures for the monitoring period.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance deed.pdf
- R_PRR_1781_2022May17.pdf
- VCS-Issuance-Representation-Single-Representor-v3.5.pdf
- VCS-Monitoring-Report-Template-v4.0 clean.pdf
- VCS-Monitoring v2.pdf
- VCS-Joint-Project-Description-Monitoring-Report-Template-v3.1.pdf
- VCS-Registration-Representation-Single-Representor-v3.4.pdf
- Project_1781_Withdrawal_Letter.pdf
- Communication agreement.pdf
- VCS-PD v2.pdf
- PDD MRMPL - .pdf
- V2-Project-Description-Monitoring-Report-Template-v3.1.pdf
- VR_2818_MRMPL_28.10.2018_Final.pdf
- 2818_VCS Verification Representation, v3.3.pdf
- 2818_VCS Validation Representation, v3.3.pdf
- VCS-Verification Deed_Updated.pdf
- Validation report MRMPL.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Report-MRMPL Clean.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-318A3664 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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