

QUALITY REPORT

# Aryan Coal 15 MW Wind Project in Maharashtra, India

VCS-298 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-458DE905 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>5.2</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.8</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.9</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.7</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage treatment, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record has several documentation gaps and contradictions, including missing evidence for some monitoring controls and conflicting statements on FPIC, safeguards, and credited volumes.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-298
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. 14.0
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	58,146 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

## Red Flags

- The monitoring report lists missing supporting documents for grid export checks, meter details, and double-counting avoidance evidence.
- Credited emissions differ materially between documents, and several safeguard-related statements conflict across the PDD and monitoring reports.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the verification documentation.

- The monitoring report flags missing evidence for JMRs, invoices, meter calibration details, and project agreements, which weakens confidence in operational controls.

The verification documentation confirms additionality through an investment test, and the monitoring report describes a quantified leakage treatment, which are both positive signs. At the same time, the project file shows no buffer pool information and no reversal history, so permanence is not strongly evidenced beyond the fact that this is a wind project. The monitoring report also lists missing evidence for JMRs, invoices, meter calibration details, and double-counting avoidance documentation, which weakens operational integrity.

### Transparency — 4.9 / 10

+ The project has multiple official documents available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with a named VVB.

- The monitoring record shows a large gap between claimed and verified ERs, and the usage monitoring method is not stated in the extracted record.

The record includes a named VVB and several official documents, which supports basic transparency. However, the extracted record does not state the usage monitoring method, and the monitoring report shows a substantial difference between claimed and verified ERs. The documentation also indicates missing vintage-wise VCU history and other supporting records, which reduces clarity around how the issuance was substantiated.

### Claim Safety — 4.7 / 10

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

- The verified emissions are far below the claimed amount, and the baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline.

Claim safety is helped by the fact that the project is not CORSIA-eligible, lowering one route for overlapping claims. Still, the verified ER volume is materially lower than the claimed amount, which raises over-crediting concern. The baseline is project-specific and the baseline reassessment timing is not stated, so the claim rests on a less robust baseline structure than a recently updated standardized approach.

### Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ The extraction drew on 18 documents and the readable portions were extracted with high confidence.

- Several key items are not stated, including buffer pool treatment, usage monitoring, and baseline reassessment timing, while the monitoring report also lists multiple missing supporting records.

The evidence base is reasonably broad, with validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance documents all present, and extraction confidence is high. Even so, several important fields are not found in the available record, including buffer pool treatment, usage monitoring, and baseline reassessment timing. The monitoring report also explicitly lists missing technical and contractual documents, which lowers documentation quality despite the number of files used.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage quantified, but deduction not stated
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Grievance mechanism present, FPIC disputed
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the missing monitoring evidence, including meter serials and calibration records, JMRs, invoices, project agreements, and double-counting declarations.

→ Resolve the document contradictions by publishing a reconciled issuance summary that explains the claimed-versus-verified ER gap and the final position on FPIC, safeguards, and benefit sharing.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report
- Validation 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-458DE905 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy