

QUALITY REPORT

Bundled Grid-Connected Wind Electricity Generation Project Identified As Bundle E3 In Maharashtra And Gujarat, India

VCS-309 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-0A986C01 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS wind avoidance project with VVB-verified additionality and no material findings reported, which supports moderate integrity. However, several key items are missing or weakly documented, including leakage quantification, baseline reassessment timing, and public-facing safeguards, so the project does not score as high-confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-309
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 14
Crediting Period	2007-02-05 — not_stated
VVB	Perry Johnson Registrars CDM Inc.
Verified ERs	29,773 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2007 — 2009
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Leakage is described as negligible in the monitoring report, but no quantified deduction is provided and the validation report reportedly did not address it.
- Safeguards are inconsistently documented: the PDD indicates safeguards, but the monitoring report says they were not mentioned, and FPIC and grievance mechanisms are not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring report.
- Leakage is not quantified, and the baseline reassessment date is not stated in available documents.

The monitoring report dated 2011-04-25 confirms additionality through an investment test and reports no material findings or corrective actions, which supports the project's core environmental integrity. The project is an avoidance wind project, so reversal risk is inherently low, but the record does not state a buffer pool and does not provide a quantified leakage deduction. The baseline is project-based, and the last reassessment date is not found in the extracted documents, which weakens robustness.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

- + The monitoring report provides a verified issuance figure of 29,773 and identifies the VVB and monitoring period.
- Public MRV completeness is limited because usage monitoring is not stated, claimed versus verified issuance cannot be compared, and the registry status is late to verify.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring report identifies the VVB, the monitoring period from 2007-02-05 to 2009-09-01, and a verified issuance amount of 29,773. However, usage monitoring is not stated, the claimed issuance figure is not available for comparison, and the registry status is late to verify. The documentation therefore supports some traceability, but not a fully complete public MRV trail.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

- + The project is an avoidance-type wind project under a standard renewable methodology, which generally lowers reversal risk.
- Leakage justification is only qualitative, the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, and the project is not CORSIA-eligible.

Claim safety is constrained by missing or qualitative-only controls on over-crediting risk. The monitoring report says leakage is deemed negligible, but the validation report reportedly did not address leakage, and no quantified deduction is provided. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk, but the baseline remains project-specific and the record does not show a recent reassessment.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence.
- The crediting period end is not stated, several safeguard fields are absent or inconsistent, and no corrective actions were required because no findings were reported.

Documentation quality is fair because multiple official documents were used and extraction confidence is high. Still, important fields are missing, including the crediting period end, buffer pool information, usage monitoring details, and quantified leakage treatment. The contradiction on safeguards is also material: the PDD indicates safeguards, while the monitoring report says they were not mentioned, so the record is incomplete on social documentation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project with low reversal risk
● Leakage	Qualitative negligible leakage only
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance not found
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a quantified leakage assessment and, if applicable, a documented deduction or justification consistent across validation and monitoring records.

→ Publish complete safeguard evidence, including FPIC, grievance mechanism, and any benefit-sharing or community consultation records, plus a clear crediting-period end date.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- 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-0A986C01 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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