QUALITY REPORT

15 MW Bundled grid-connected wind electricity generation project in Radhapuram Taluk of Tirunelveli District in Tamil Nadu, India

VCS-314 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-57B66B5E · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.5 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.9
	Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected wind project under AMS I.D with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no reported material findings or corrective actions. However, key elements affecting credit quality—especially leakage treatment and baseline reassessment—are unclear or inconsistent across documents, and there is a major discrepancy in verified ER figures between two validation reports.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-314
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D 14
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	71,419 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- ■ Large contradiction in verified emission reductions: 71,419 vs 149,672 across two 2023 validation reports
- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while another source indicates leakage was quantified
- ■ Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The verification/monitoring record reports additionality confirmed by the VVB using an investment test and no material findings or corrective actions.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, increasing over-crediting risk.

The monitoring record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports additionality robustness. The monitoring report states no material findings and no corrective actions, which is a positive integrity signal. However, leakage is stated as not addressed in the monitoring report (2023-02-24), and the baseline is project-specific with no stated baseline reassessment date, both of which weaken confidence in conservative crediting.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Monitoring period and claimed vs verified ERs are provided and match in the monitoring record (71,419).

- Conflicting ER figures across validation reports and unclear leakage treatment reduce MRV clarity.

The monitoring report clearly states the monitoring period (2012-03-28 to 2016-03-27) and shows claimed and verified ERs as equal at 71,419, which supports transparency for that period. The VVB is identified as VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd., aiding traceability. Transparency is reduced by conflicting ER values across two validation reports and inconsistent leakage statements across sources, which makes it harder to reconcile the public record.

Claim Safety — 5.9 / 10

+ Uses a standard small-scale grid-connected renewable methodology (AMS I.D) with a stated grid emission factor (0.927).

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated and contradictory ER figures elevate greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

The project applies AMS I.D (version 14) and reports a grid emission factor of 0.927, which is directionally consistent with grid-displacement accounting. Claim safety is weakened because CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, leaving buyers uncertain about eligibility-based claims. The contradiction in verified ER totals (71,419 vs 149,672) materially increases the risk of overstated climate claims unless reconciled.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are available (PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 11 documents used.

- Contradictions between older validation and newer monitoring on safeguards/FPIC/grievance and between 2023 validation reports on ERs indicate reliability issues.

The extracted record includes multiple key document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and uses 11 documents with high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation base. Nevertheless, there are notable inconsistencies between the 2009 validation report and 2023 monitoring report on safeguards, grievance mechanism, FPIC, and benefit sharing, suggesting either later improvements or inconsistent reporting. The presence of two 2023 validation reports with conflicting verified ER totals is a significant documentation reliability concern.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No reversal risk for wind generation
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed / inconsistent
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistently documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note (or updated verification/issuance statement) explaining why two 2023 validation reports show different verified ER totals and which figure is authoritative for issuance.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment (even if zero) with justification consistent across PDD/monitoring/verification, and state when the baseline/grid emission factor was last reassessed (including the grid EF vintage year).

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-57B66B5E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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