QUALITY REPORT

ENERGY FROM RENEWABLES IN MAHARASHTRA

VCS-296 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-6576ABCA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.5 Overall Score out of 10		
	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.0
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.8
	Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS renewable electricity project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a verified issuance quantity for the 2006–2009 monitoring period. However, key integrity elements are weakly evidenced in the extracted record, especially leakage treatment and baseline reassessment timing. Safeguards information is inconsistent across documents, increasing reputational and disclosure risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-296
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2016
Project Methodology	AMS I.D. 14
Crediting Period	2006 — 2009
VVB	SGS United Kingdom Limited
Verified ERs	9,593 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2006 — 2009
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report and no leakage deduction is evidenced in the extracted record.
- ■ Safeguards coverage is contradictory between the PDD and the monitoring report, creating uncertainty about social risk management.
- ■ Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB.

- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is evidenced in the extracted record, weakening completeness of the GHG accounting.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (validation report). The baseline approach is project-specific (PDD/validation documentation), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which reduces confidence in baseline robustness over time. Leakage is explicitly not addressed in the monitoring report and no leakage deduction is evidenced in the extracted record, leaving a completeness gap for the GHG boundary. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the monitoring report, which is a positive signal for conformance during verification.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period (2006-04-01 to 2009-03-31) and a verified ER total of 9,593 tCO2e.

- The claimed ER total is not found in the extracted record, limiting cross-checking between claimed vs verified outcomes.

The monitoring report (2010-09-29) clearly states the monitoring period (2006-04-01—2009-03-31) and reports verified emission reductions of 9,593 tCO2e. The VVB is identified as SGS United Kingdom Limited, supporting traceability of assurance. However, the claimed ER total is not found in the extracted record, so the claimed-versus-verified reconciliation cannot be checked here. Several MRV-relevant fields (e.g., usage monitoring method) are not stated in available documents, limiting transparency on data collection procedures in this extract.

Claim Safety — 6.8 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Contradictions on safeguards and additionality test type increase greenwashing/over-crediting perception risk even if ERs were verified.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of contentious aviation-related claims. The baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents, which can elevate perceived over-crediting risk compared with standardized/jurisdictional baselines. Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, which can also increase over-crediting concerns even for grid-connected renewable projects if displacement or upstream effects are debated. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on CCP labeling as an additional quality screen here.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- Some key fields are missing from the extracted record (e.g., buffer pool, leakage deduction, baseline reassessment), indicating incomplete evidencing for quality assessment.

The extracted record includes key document types (PDD dated 2009-11-16, validation report dated 2009-11-17, and monitoring report dated 2010-09-29), and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting usability of the evidence. The monitoring period and crediting period are aligned (both 2006-04-01—2009-03-31), indicating temporal consistency in the available documentation. Still, several important quality fields are not stated in available documents (e.g., leakage deduction, buffer pool percentage, baseline reassessment date), which limits a full quality appraisal from the extract alone.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events evidenced
Leakage	Leakage not addressed / deduction not evidenced
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistently documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment and, if applicable, a quantified leakage deduction (or a documented justification for negligible leakage) in monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Publish clearer safeguards evidence (FPIC where relevant, grievance mechanism, and stakeholder consultation outcomes) and ensure consistency between the PDD and monitoring/verification reports.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-6576ABCA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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