QUALITY REPORT

100 MW grid connected Wind Power project in Jamnagar Gujarat, India

VCS-2019 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-CE2BFA6A · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.1
	Transparency (25%)	5.0
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
	Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS wind project with VVB-confirmed investment-test additionality and no reported material findings, which supports moderate integrity. However, the monitoring report leaves important gaps on leakage treatment, supporting evidence, and some monitoring details, and there are contradictions across documents that reduce confidence in the claimed reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2019
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 19.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	Applus Certification
Verified ERs	314,731 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, while an earlier validation report reportedly quantified it, creating a documentation inconsistency.
- The verification team requested missing supporting documents for generation, calibration, grievance records, and double-counting declarations, indicating incomplete audit evidence.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring record.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and the project-specific baseline has not been reassessed in the available record.

The project benefits from a VVB-confirmed investment test, which is a meaningful positive for additionality, and the monitoring record reports no material findings. Still, the monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, while the contradiction log says an earlier validation report quantified leakage; I privileged the more recent monitoring report because it is the latest project-specific evidence, but the inconsistency lowers confidence. The baseline is project-specific and the available record does not show a recent reassessment, so permanence and baseline robustness are only moderate.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a verified emissions reduction figure in the monitoring report.

- The report requests missing supporting documents and does not state key monitoring details such as usage monitoring method or grid emission factor year.

Transparency is mixed: the project has a named verifier, a clear monitoring period, and a verified emissions reduction total, which helps. But the monitoring report also asks for missing supporting documents such as commissioning certificates, PPA, invoices, calibration records, and grievance-register copies, and key operational details like the usage monitoring method and grid emission factor year are not stated in the extracted record. That leaves the MRV trail incomplete even though the extraction confidence is high.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

+ The project is a renewable wind installation under ACM0002, which generally lowers over-crediting risk compared with more complex methodologies.

- Leakage justification is inconsistent across documents, and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is a grid-connected wind project under ACM0002, a standard renewable methodology, and additionality was verified. The main concern is that leakage treatment is unclear and the record does not provide CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so dual-claim and over-crediting risk cannot be fully ruled out. The contradiction on leakage treatment also weakens confidence in the robustness of the credited reductions.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material.

- The monitoring report contains several requested follow-up items and the extraction record notes a poorly complete evidence trail for some calculations and declarations.

Documentation is reasonably broad, with evidence drawn from issuance, the PDD, validation, and monitoring documents, and the extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report itself lists several missing items and requests further supporting evidence, including generation support, calibration records, grievance documentation, and a double-counting declaration. The crediting period also differs between the monitoring report and the PDD, which suggests the document set is not fully harmonized.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Wind avoidance project
Leakage	Leakage not addressed
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment missing
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	Eligibility/status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled leakage assessment and explain the difference between the monitoring report and the earlier validation report.

→ Publish the missing supporting evidence for generation, calibration, grievance handling, and double-counting declarations, along with a clear statement on CORSIA eligibility and CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation

Report ID: CM-CE2BFA6A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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