

QUALITY REPORT

4.5 MW bundled wind power project

VCS-305 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-CC1F8BCE · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.4
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
■ 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-confirmed additionality, but the evidence base is uneven and several key safeguards and leakage details are weakly documented. The monitoring report also contains multiple corrective actions and there are contradictions across documents on grievance handling, leakage treatment, credited period, and verified emissions reductions, which lowers confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-305
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D 14
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Verified ERs	5,103 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, despite an earlier validation report describing it as negligible.
- The documents conflict on the credited period and verified emissions reductions, and the monitoring report lists numerous corrective actions and missing supporting records.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.4 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the verification materials.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the monitoring report, and no leakage deduction is stated.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the VVB confirmed additionality through an investment test, and the project is a wind power activity under AMS I.D. However, leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, no leakage deduction is stated, and no buffer pool or reversal information is available, so permanence and leakage controls are only weakly evidenced. The project-specific baseline and the absence of a recent reassessment also limit robustness.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + A named VVB, TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd, is identified and the monitoring period is stated in the monitoring report.
- The monitoring report shows many corrective actions and missing source records, including calibration certificates, JMRs, invoices, and complete ER sheets.

Transparency is moderate at best: the VVB is named, the monitoring period is stated, and verified reductions are reported as 5,103 tCO₂e in the monitoring record. Against that, the monitoring report lists many corrective actions and notes missing supporting documents such as technical equipment details, commissioning certificates, PPAs, O&M; agreements, JMRs, invoices, and calibration certificates, which weakens MRV traceability.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

- + The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk on that channel.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is constrained by the project-specific baseline, the lack of a stated leakage deduction, and the contradiction between a validation report that treated leakage as negligible and a monitoring report that says it was not addressed. The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which helps on one channel, but there is no CCP status stated. The conflicting verified emissions figures across documents also raise over-crediting and reliability concerns.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were available, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material.
- The monitoring report records numerous unresolved documentation gaps and the extraction confidence is not impaired, but the underlying project file still shows incomplete supporting evidence.

The document set is reasonably broad, with evidence drawn from the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related records, and the extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report contains numerous corrective actions and several missing source records, and the crediting period information conflicts between documents. That combination suggests the file is usable but not fully clean or complete.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline
● Safeguards	Partial safeguards, no FPIC or grievance
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, reconciled MRV package with source documents for metering, calibration, invoices, JMRs, and ER sheets, plus a clear explanation of all corrective actions.

→ Resolve the document contradictions on leakage, credited period, and verified emissions reductions, and publish a quantified leakage assessment with a documented baseline reassessment.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-CC1F8BCE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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