

QUALITY REPORT

2.45 MW Wind Power Project in Rajasthan, India by Yamuna Power and Infrastructure Ltd.

VCS-308 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-DEDE39D1 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.8

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 in the available verification record. However, leakage is not addressed in the later monitoring record, baseline reassessment is not stated, and there are contradictions across documents on safeguards and the verified emissions reduction figure, which reduce confidence in the claim quality.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-308
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D. 14
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	17,450 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The later monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while an earlier monitoring report reportedly quantified it, creating a documentation inconsistency.
- The verified emissions reduction figure differs across validation-related documents, and the project is not CORSIA-eligible.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring record.
- Leakage justification is not addressed in the later monitoring report, and no leakage deduction percentage is stated.

The monitoring record confirms additionality through an investment test and says the VVB verified it, which supports the core project case. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, but the record does not state a buffer pool, reversal events, or a leakage deduction percentage, and leakage is explicitly marked as not addressed in the later monitoring report. The baseline is project-based, but the last reassessment date is not stated in the extracted documents.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and claimed and verified emissions reductions are both reported.
- The record does not state a usage monitoring method, and the baseline was not shown to have been recently reassessed.

The project has a named verifier, Earthood Services Private Limited, and the monitoring period and crediting period are both stated. Claimed and verified emissions reductions are both 17,450 in the extracted monitoring record, which helps traceability, but the usage monitoring method is not stated and the grid emission factor year is missing. The documentation is reasonably complete, though not fully transparent on operational monitoring details.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

- + The project is a renewable wind project with a project baseline and no reversal events reported in the extracted record.
- Leakage treatment is weak or inconsistent, and the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which limits claim safety.

As a wind power project under a project baseline, the core claim is straightforward, but the absence of a stated leakage deduction and the later note that leakage was not addressed weaken over-crediting protection. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk, but CCP status is not stated. No reversal events are reported, which is appropriate for an avoidance-style renewable project.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

- + The extraction draws on multiple official documents, with 21 documents used and high extraction confidence.
- + No material findings or corrective actions were reported in the available verification record.

The evidence base is fairly strong, with 21 documents used and high extraction confidence. The record also shows no material findings and no corrective actions required in the available verification material. Documentation quality is weakened by missing specifics on baseline reassessment, leakage treatment, and usage monitoring, but overall it is better than average.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed consistently
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance present, but contradictory
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, dated leakage assessment and any deduction applied, with reconciliation to the earlier monitoring record.

→ Publish the baseline reassessment history, usage monitoring method, and a document trail explaining the emissions reduction figure discrepancy.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- 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-DEDE39D1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy