QUALITY REPORT

6 MW Wind Power Project in Maharashtra by PTC India

VCS-458 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-B74D3E64 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3
Overall Score
out of 10

Integrity (35%)	4.2
Transparency (25%)	6.0
Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
Documentation (15%)	6.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project is a VCS wind power activity using AMS-I.D with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported, which supports basic credibility. However, key baseline and leakage parameters are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and the monitoring report includes multiple corrective actions related to metering, calibration, and incomplete data, increasing over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-458
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D Version 151
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	69,543 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

■ Monitoring report corrective actions cite missing/incomplete monitoring data and unclear meter continuity/calibration across the monitoring period.

■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (deemed negligible vs not addressed), weakening confidence in the completeness of the quantification narrative.

■ Baseline inputs (grid emission factor and year) are not found in the extracted record, limiting independent checks of credited reductions.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation report).

- Baseline and leakage substantiation are weak in the extracted record (project-specific baseline; grid emission factor and reassessment timing not found; leakage inconsistently treated across documents).

The validation report confirms additionality via VVB assessment, which supports the additionality case even though the specific test type is not found in the extracted record. The baseline is project-specific (AMS-I.D), but key baseline parameters such as the grid emission factor and the year used are not found in the extracted record, limiting robustness checks. Leakage is not consistently handled: the validation report describes leakage as deemed negligible, while the monitoring report indicates it is not addressed, which weakens confidence in completeness. No material findings are reported, but the monitoring report's corrective actions on metering and missing data create integrity risk around quantified generation and ER calculations.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ VVB is identified (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. / Applus+ Certification) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (monitoring report).

- Claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record and the monitoring report flags incomplete ER sheets and missing months, reducing MRV transparency.

The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2014-03-31 to 2018-03-30 (monitoring report), and the VVB is clearly identified (Applus+). However, total claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record, preventing a straightforward claimed-versus-verified comparison. The monitoring report lists several corrective actions (missing months in the ER sheet, incomplete datasets, unclear meter details), which reduces transparency and auditability of the monitoring evidence trail.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing cross-program claim risk (registry extract).

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by MRV issues (missing data, unclear metering details) and an internal inconsistency in verified ER figures across validation report versions.

The project is indicated as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of claims being marketed under multiple eligibility labels. Nonetheless, the monitoring report raises MRV weaknesses (incomplete data and unclear metering continuity/calibration), which increases over-crediting and greenwashing risk if credits are claimed without clear, complete underlying evidence. In addition, the extracted record shows inconsistent verified ER figures across validation report dates, which further elevates claim risk until reconciled.

Documentation — 6.6 / 10

+ Multiple core document types are present (validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Numerous corrective actions in the monitoring report indicate documentation quality/control issues (template errors, incorrect crediting period end date, incomplete datasets).

The extracted record includes key document types (validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and uses multiple documents overall, with high extraction confidence. Documentation quality is mixed because the monitoring report includes numerous corrective actions (template/content errors, incorrect DNA/MoEFCC naming, incorrect crediting period end date, incomplete monitoring datasets, and unclear meter specifications). These issues suggest weaknesses in document control and completeness even if ultimately correctable through the VVB process.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality (test type not specified)
● **Permanence**	Renewable energy project with no reversal risk indicated
● **Leakage**	Leakage inconsistently treated (negligible vs not addressed)
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; key baseline inputs not evidenced
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance reported but contradicted across d
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/append the full baseline calculation inputs used for ER quantification (grid emission factor value, year, and source) and clearly state when/if it was reassessed.

→ Resolve MRV corrective actions by providing complete monthly generation datasets, clear main/check meter specifications, evidence of meter continuity, and calibration certificates covering the full monitoring period, then disclose the final corrected ER sheet.

→ Reconcile and explain the inconsistent verified ER figures across validation report versions and provide a single authoritative issuance/verification summary table.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-B74D3E64 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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