QUALITY REPORT

Bundled Wind Power Project in Tamilnadu, India, Co-ordinated by Tamilnadu Spinning Mills Association(TASMA-II)

VCS-249 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-5EFA7763 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	4.4
Transparency (25%)	4.8
Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS wind project with VVB-verified additionality and no material findings reported in the latest monitoring record. However, the documentation shows major transparency and reliability weaknesses, including a large historical discrepancy in verified emission reductions, weak leakage treatment, and conflicting safeguard records across documents.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-249
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 10
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	TUV NORD
Verified ERs	20,149 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- ■ A large contradiction exists in verified emission reductions: one validation record shows 20,149 while an earlier validation record shows 3,262,867, which raises reliability concerns.

- ■ The monitoring report says leakage is deemed negligible, but no quantified deduction is provided and earlier documentation said leakage was not addressed.

- ■ Safeguard records conflict on grievance mechanisms and FPIC, and the latest monitoring report still says no grievance mechanism was in place.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.4 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment analysis and the VVB, TUV NORD, confirmed it.

- Leakage is only described as negligible, with no quantified deduction, and the project uses a project-specific baseline rather than a recently reassessed standardized one.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the VVB, TUV NORD, confirmed additionality through an investment test, and the latest monitoring report reports no material findings. That said, the baseline is project-specific and the leakage treatment is only described as negligible without a quantified deduction, which weakens robustness. The absence of any stated buffer pool also leaves permanence-style risk management less clearly documented, even though this is a wind project with no reversal events reported.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The latest monitoring report and validation report provide a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and matching claimed versus verified emission reductions of 20,149.

- Documentation quality is weakened by contradictory records and many corrective actions, including comments that the investment analysis was not transparent and data references were not clearly traceable.

Transparency is mixed: the latest monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period and the verified emission reduction figure matches the claimed amount at 20,149. However, the record also contains a major discrepancy in verified emission reductions, with an earlier validation record showing 3,262,867, which undermines confidence in the reporting trail. The documentation also notes that the investment analysis was not transparent and that data references for OM and BM were not clearly traceable.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.

- The very large discrepancy between earlier and later verified emission reduction figures, plus unquantified leakage treatment, increases over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the large contradiction in verified emission reductions and by the lack of a quantified leakage deduction. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-claim exposure, but the project-specific baseline and the unresolved leakage treatment still leave over-crediting concerns. Because the latest record privileges the 20,149 figure from the more recent validation report, the score reflects that value while discounting reliability due to the conflicting earlier validation record.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were available, including validation, monitoring, and PDD records, and extraction confidence is high.

- The record includes numerous corrective actions and several unresolved or conflicting statements across documents, especially on safeguards and crediting period dates.

The project has a reasonably broad document set, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report lists many corrective actions, including 08 CARs and comments that CDM requirements had not been met and that the investment analysis needed to be more transparent. The crediting period also differs between the PDD and the later monitoring record, which adds to documentation inconsistency.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No reversal events, but buffer pool not stated
Leakage	Negligible claim without quantified deduction
Baseline	Project-specific baseline, reassessment timing missing
Safeguards	FPIC noted, but grievance mechanism absent in latest record
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a fully traceable reconciliation of the conflicting verified emission reduction figures and explain which document controls the final issued amount.

→ Quantify leakage treatment, clarify safeguard implementation across all periods, and publish a transparent baseline and additionality evidence trail with clear source references.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Confidential
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-5EFA7763 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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