QUALITY REPORT

Positive Climate Care 4.67 MW Bundled Grid Connected Wind Power Project Activity In Jaisalmer, Rajasthan, India

VCS-499 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-A1331B72 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.2
Transparency (25%)	5.0
Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
Documentation (15%)	6.3

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, which supports baseline credibility for an avoidance activity. However, multiple MRV and consistency issues (including large gaps between claimed and verified reductions and numerous corrective actions) increase over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-499
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D 14
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	TUV SUD South Asia Private Limited
Verified ERs	13,233 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Large discrepancy between claimed and verified emission reductions (21,927 claimed vs 13,233 verified) indicates material MRV/quantification risk.

■ Extensive corrective actions requested in the monitoring report, including missing/unclear source documents (JMRs, invoices, meter calibrations, wheeling agreement) and inconsistencies in who exports power and to which DISCOM.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed via an investment test by the VVB.

- The monitoring report (2023) lists numerous MRV inconsistencies and missing evidence that can affect baseline emissions and net electricity exported calculations.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation report). The baseline is project-specific under AMS I.D for grid-connected wind, but there is no extracted evidence of a recent baseline reassessment date. Integrity is weakened by the monitoring report (2023) raising substantive quantification issues (apportioning methodology, line losses, wheeling/export clarity, missing JMRs and incoherent datasets), which can directly affect net MWh and credited reductions.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ Key project identifiers and MRV basics are present (VVB named as TÜV SÜD; monitoring period 2012-10-02 to 2016-03-31; grid emission factor 0.906).

- Several core quantification elements are incomplete or inconsistent across documents (e.g., leakage treatment and safeguards/grievance statements; unclear apportioning/line losses and wheeling/export details in the monitoring report).

Transparency is mixed: the VVB is identified (TÜV SÜD South Asia Private Limited) and the monitoring period and grid emission factor (0.906) are available (monitoring report). However, the monitoring report (2023) documents multiple inconsistencies in project descriptions and data tables, and requests key supporting evidence (monthly credit reports, invoices, meter calibrations, O&M; agreements, commissioning certificates, prior verification reports). Leakage treatment is also inconsistent across monitoring reports, reducing clarity on whether leakage was assessed and how.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Conflicting verified ER figures across validation reports (13,233 vs 17,756) and the large claimed-versus-verified gap elevate over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

Claim safety benefits from the project being explicitly not CORSIA-eligible (registry/eligibility record), lowering the risk of aviation-related double-claim narratives. Over-crediting risk remains meaningful because the extracted record shows a large gap between claimed and verified reductions (21,927 claimed vs 13,233 verified), and because the monitoring report (2023) highlights data quality and boundary/export attribution issues. The absence of a stated CCP status in the extracted record leaves some uncertainty about broader market-claim screening.

Documentation — 6.3 / 10

+ A relatively broad document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 14 documents used.

- The monitoring report (2023) explicitly requests multiple missing primary documents and clarifications, indicating documentation gaps at the evidence level.

Documentation coverage is moderate: multiple document types are present (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report (2023) itself indicates missing or poor-quality underlying evidence (e.g., unreadable JMR soft copies, missing wheeling agreement, missing months of JMRs, and requests for meter calibration and invoices). These gaps suggest that while documents exist, the evidentiary chain supporting calculations is not consistently complete.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals indicated
Leakage	Negligible claimed but inconsistently addressed
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Mentioned but inconsistent across reports; FPIC not evidenced
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/attach the complete primary evidence chain for the monitoring period (JMRs for all months, invoices, state authority credit reports, meter calibration certificates, wheeling agreements, and O&M; agreements) and clearly reconcile to the ER spreadsheet.

→ Provide a single, corrected MRV narrative clarifying apportioning methodology, line losses, which WTGs wheel/export to the grid, and the correct DISCOM/offtaker, with consistent identifiers matching commissioning certificates.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-A1331B72 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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