QUALITY REPORT

2.5 MW Bundled Wind Power Project in Maharashtra (India)

VCS-482 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-47155033 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.4
	Transparency (25%)	5.1
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	Documentation (15%)	4.9

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality, which supports the core integrity case. However, the monitoring record shows several documentation gaps, leakage is not addressed, and there are material contradictions across documents that reduce confidence in the claimed emissions reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-482
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D Version 13: EB 36
Crediting Period	2007 — 2017
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	18,410 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and no leakage deduction is stated.
- ■ The monitoring report lists multiple missing supporting documents, including calibration certificates, invoices, JMRs, and complete ER sheets.
- ■ There are contradictions between the older and newer documents on safeguards, FPIC, leakage treatment, grid factor, and credited emissions.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring report.

- Leakage justification is not addressed, and reversal events are marked as not addressed rather than clearly ruled out.

The project’s additionality case is reasonably strong because the monitoring report says additionality was tested through an investment test and verified by the VVB, LGAI Technological Center / Applus+ Certification. The baseline method is project-based, which is acceptable but less robust than a standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and leakage is not addressed in the extracted monitoring record. Reversal risk is not a major issue for a wind project, but the record does not clearly document a buffer pool or a formal reversal treatment.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period, with verified emissions reductions reported in the monitoring report.

- The monitoring report notes missing source documents and incomplete ER sheets, which weakens MRV transparency.

Transparency is mixed. The project has a named verifier and a long monitoring period, and the monitoring report reports 18,410 verified tCO_2e, but the same report also says the PP did not provide JMRs, invoices, complete ER sheets, calibration certificates, and other supporting records. That weakens traceability of the verified figure and suggests the MRV package is incomplete.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized baseline, and leakage treatment is unclear.

Claim safety is moderate to weak because the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but the baseline is project-specific and leakage is not addressed. The extracted record does not show a quantified leakage deduction or a usage monitoring method, so over-crediting risk cannot be ruled out confidently. The absence of a CCP status also leaves the broader quality label unresolved.

Documentation — 4.9 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were available, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material.

- The monitoring report itself says key supporting records were not provided, and the extraction record includes several contradictions across documents.

Documentation quality is limited by the missing supporting evidence noted by the monitoring report and by the contradictions across documents. The extraction confidence is high, but the report still flags absent technical equipment details, commissioning certificates, PPAs, O&M; agreements, calibration certificates, and complete ER sheets. The project documents are also not fully aligned on the crediting period, safeguards, FPIC, leakage treatment, grid factor, and emissions totals.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project with low reversal risk
Leakage	Leakage not addressed
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the missing source records, including calibration certificates, invoices, JMRs, complete ER sheets, and equipment/commissioning documentation.

→ Clarify leakage treatment, reconcile the contradictory emissions and crediting-period figures, and document why the newer monitoring report should override older values.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-47155033 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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