QUALITY REPORT

# Bundled Grid Connected 2.9 M.W. Wind Power Project In India By Kamal Engineering Corporation [Unit Of Kec Industries Ltd]

VCS-245 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-C2FE04C1 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **4.3** Overall Score out of 10 | Integrity (35%) | 4.2 |
| | Transparency (25%) | 4.8 |
| | Claim Safety (25%) | 3.6 |
| | Documentation (15%) | 5.1 |

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a wind avoidance project with VVB-verified additionality, but the record shows important reliability and claim-quality weaknesses. The biggest concerns are the large contradiction in verified emission reductions, leakage treatment that is inconsistent across documents, and weak safeguard documentation in the monitoring report.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| **Registry** | Verra (VCS) |
| **Registry ID** | VCS-245 |
| **Sector** | renewable_energy |
| **Country** | India |
| **Vintage** | Stale |
| **Project Methodology** | AMS I.D. 13 |
| **Crediting Period** | 2006 — 2016 |
| **VVB** | Merry Johnson Registrars Clean Development Mechanism Inc. |
| **Verified ERs** | 251,000 tCO2e |
| **Monitoring Period** | 2006 — 2014 |
| **Confidence** | Medium |
| **Documents Reviewed** | 12 documents reviewed |
| **Scored** | 2026-04-15 |

## Red Flags

- ■ Verified emission reductions conflict sharply across validation reports, with one document showing 251,000 and an earlier one showing 5,479; this raises reliability concerns.

- ■ Leakage is described as not addressed in the monitoring report, while a later validation report says it was negligible, creating uncertainty about claim robustness.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.2 / 10

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

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent, and the monitoring report does not address it while the later validation report only says it was negligible.

The project shows some integrity support because the validation record confirms an investment-based additionality test and VVB verification. However, the monitoring report does not address leakage, and the later validation report only characterizes leakage as negligible, so the treatment is not consistently documented. No reversal events are reported, but buffer pool coverage is not found in the extracted record, which leaves permanence-related assurance incomplete.

### Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has multiple official documents available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with a high extraction confidence.

- The monitoring record shows corrective actions were needed for calibration frequency clarification and invoice-to-spreadsheet data transfer errors.

Transparency is moderate because the record includes a validation report, monitoring report, PDD, and issuance information, and extraction confidence is high. At the same time, the monitoring report notes corrective actions for calibration frequency clarification and data transfer errors from invoices to the spreadsheet, which weakens MRV clarity. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, but registry completeness around claim channels is limited because CCP status is not stated.

### Claim Safety — 3.6 / 10

- The project is not CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated, so dual-market claim risk is not fully resolved.

- The large discrepancy in verified emission reductions between validation documents weakens confidence in the volume of credits claimed.

Claim safety is weakened by the large contradiction in verified emission reductions: one validation report shows 251,000 while an earlier validation report shows 5,479. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one type of dual-claim risk, but CCP status is not stated, so the broader claim picture remains incomplete. The baseline is project-based rather than standardized or jurisdictional, which is less robust for over-crediting control.

### Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ Several core documents were used, and the extraction confidence is high.

- The monitoring report is dated 2010 while the crediting period extends to 2016, and the record contains multiple contradictions across documents.

Documentation is reasonably broad because multiple official documents were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records. Still, the monitoring report is relatively old compared with the full crediting period, and the record contains several contradictions on emission reductions, leakage, and safeguards. The presence of corrective actions and the absence of some key quantified fields, such as buffer pool coverage, also limit documentation strength.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| ● **Additionality** | VVB-confirmed investment test |
| ● **Permanence** | No reversal events, buffer not stated |
| ● **Leakage** | Leakage treatment inconsistent |
| ● **Baseline** | Project baseline, reassessment not stated |
| ● **Safeguards** | No safeguards documented in monitoring record |
| ● **Double-claim** | Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions statement that explains the discrepancy between the two validation figures and identifies the final verified issuance basis.

→ Publish a complete leakage and safeguards package, including quantified leakage treatment, buffer or reversal protection details, and documented FPIC/grievance evidence.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Proof of Right
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation



Report ID: CM-C2FE04C1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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