

## QUALITY REPORT

# Bundled Wind Power Project in Gujarat and Tamil Nadu

VCS-1862 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-4B7578F3 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.4**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.8</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.1</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.8</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths: additionality was tested using an investment test and confirmed by the VVB, and no material findings were reported. However, the monitoring record leaves important gaps on leakage, meter calibration, and some generation inputs, which weakens confidence in the issued credits. There are also contradictions across documents on total verified emissions reductions, leakage treatment, and social safeguard statements, so the record is not fully reliable.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1862
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. 18.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2024
VVB	TUV SUD SOUTH ASIA PVT LTD
Verified ERs	39,951 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

## Red Flags

- The monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while the validation report treated it as not applicable.
- The verified emissions reduction figure differs sharply across validation documents, and the monitoring report contains blank or missing generation values for some months.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was tested through an investment test and the VVB confirmed it in the validation report.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and reversal treatment is not addressed; the project is wind power, so the permanence risk is low but not fully documented.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test and says the VVB verified it, which supports the project's core integrity case. No material findings were reported, but the monitoring report leaves leakage unaddressed and says reversal treatment is not addressed, so the permanence and leakage record is incomplete. Because this is a wind project, permanence risk is inherently lower, but the documentation still does not fully close the loop.

### Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the VVB is named as TUV SUD South Asia Pvt Ltd.

- The monitoring report notes missing meter calibration details and blank net generation values for some months, reducing MRV clarity.

The project has a named VVB and a clearly defined monitoring period in the monitoring report, which helps transparency. However, the report also says details of electricity meters and calibration are missing, and some months have blank net generation values and missing invoice-based generation values. Those gaps reduce confidence in the MRV trail even though the extraction confidence is high.

### Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is a renewable wind project under VCS, which generally lowers baseline and over-crediting risk compared with fossil fuel projects.

- The monitoring report gives no leakage justification, and the verified emissions reduction figure is inconsistent across validation documents, which raises over-crediting concerns.

Claim safety is weakened by the lack of a leakage justification in the monitoring report and by the inconsistent emissions reduction figures across validation documents. I privileged the more recent validation report value of 39,951 because it is later than the earlier validation figure of 76,282, but the contradiction itself signals reliability risk. The project's renewable wind nature helps, yet the missing leakage treatment and inconsistent figures keep over-crediting risk above average.

### Documentation — 6.0 / 10

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

- The monitoring report requires corrective actions on meter details and missing generation data, showing incomplete documentation quality.

Documentation is reasonably broad, with validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records all used, and the extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report requires corrective actions on meter and calibration details and on missing generation data, which shows the record is not fully complete. The crediting period is also broader than the monitoring period, so the latest monitoring evidence does not fully cover the whole issuance history.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	Investment test VVB-confirmed
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal treatment documented
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed in monitoring
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance noted, but inconsistent
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions reduction schedule that explains the difference between the 39,951 and 76,282 figures and ties each value to the correct issuance period.

→ Add complete meter calibration records, monthly generation inputs, and a clear leakage and reversal treatment statement in the monitoring documentation.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation 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-4B7578F3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy