

QUALITY REPORT

6.25 MW Wind Power Generation project of Salora International Limited

VCS-269 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-D7D4EAC8 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.8
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.9
■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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 material findings reported, which supports moderate integrity. However, the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly reassessed, leakage treatment is only described as quantified without a visible deduction value, and the record contains several contradictions that reduce confidence in the evidence trail.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-269
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 13
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	52,863 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The record shows a large discrepancy in verified ERs between documents, and the later validation report is being privileged because it is more recent and appears to reflect the final issuance position.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual deduction percentage is not stated in the extracted record, leaving a gap in over-crediting assessment.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

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

- The baseline is project-specific and the last reassessment date is not stated; leakage deduction is not visible in the extracted record.

The project benefits from VVB-confirmed additionality through an investment test, and the available verification record reports no material findings. That said, the baseline is described only as project-based, the last reassessment date is not stated, and the leakage deduction percentage is not visible even though leakage is said to be quantified. No reversal events are reported, which is appropriate for a wind avoidance project, but permanence evidence is still limited by the absence of a buffer-pool figure.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and the monitoring report and validation report are both present in the evidence set.

- Usage monitoring details are not stated, and the record shows a major discrepancy in verified ER totals across documents.

Transparency is moderate because the record includes a named VVB, a monitoring period, and multiple official documents, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials. However, usage monitoring methodology is not stated, and the extracted record does not show the grid emission factor year or a clear leakage deduction value. The large discrepancy in verified ER totals across documents also weakens the clarity of the public record.

Claim Safety — 5.9 / 10

+ The project is a renewable wind installation under VCS, with no reversal events reported and no material findings in the available verification record.

- Leakage treatment is incomplete in the extracted facts, and the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which limits claim portability.

Claim safety is mixed. The project is a VCS wind project with no reversal events reported and no material findings, which supports lower physical-risk concerns, but the leakage treatment is incomplete in the extracted facts and the baseline is not clearly standardized or recently reassessed. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of claim risk, but the absence of a visible leakage deduction and the ER discrepancy keep over-crediting risk above ideal.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ The evidence set includes multiple official document types, and extraction confidence is high.

- Several corrective actions were required, including missing commissioning and meter documentation, which indicates the file was not fully complete at review.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. The evidence set spans several official document types and extraction confidence is high, yet the monitoring report still lists multiple corrective actions, including missing commissioning certificates, meter details, and some historical invoice/JMR gaps. The project dates are also relatively old, with a monitoring period ending in 2016 and later review activity in 2021, so recency is limited.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Wind avoidance project; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage described as quantified, but deduction not visible
● Baseline	Project baseline; reassessment timing not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the leakage deduction percentage, baseline reassessment history, and usage monitoring method in a single consolidated monitoring note.

→ Resolve the ER total discrepancy with a clear issuance reconciliation and provide the missing meter, commissioning, and historical generation evidence in a complete audit trail.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification 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-D7D4EAC8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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