QUALITY REPORT

10 MW Wind Power Project In Maharashtra By Deepak Fertilizers And Petrochemicals Corporation Limited

VCS-566 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-0198D1B5 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected renewable electricity project with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the extracted record. However, multiple internal document contradictions (ERR totals, grid emission factor, and crediting period) and weak/unclear leakage treatment reduce confidence in the robustness of credited outcomes.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-566
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2013, 2014, 2015
Project Methodology	AMS Type I – Renewable Energy Project and Category I.D.- Grid connected renewable electricity generation 15
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	281,345 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Major inconsistencies across documents on verified/claimed ERs (281,345 vs 64,883) and grid emission factor (0.62286 vs 0.82), indicating data reliability risk

■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports (earlier report says quantified; later report says not addressed), with no clear leakage deduction stated

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

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

- Leakage is not consistently treated (later monitoring report says not addressed; no leakage deduction found), and baseline reassessment timing is not stated

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test. The baseline is project-specific (project baseline), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record. Leakage is a key weakness: the later monitoring report (2021-07-01) says leakage was not addressed, while an earlier monitoring report (2010-01-29) indicates leakage was quantified, and no leakage deduction percentage is found.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ VVB is identified (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. / Applus+ Certification) and both claimed and verified ER totals are present in the extracted record

- Key MRV figures are contradictory across versions (ER totals, grid emission factor, crediting period), reducing transparency and auditability

The extracted record identifies the VVB (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. / Applus+ Certification) and provides a monitoring period (2013-01-01 to 2019-10-06). However, transparency is reduced by major inconsistencies across document versions on core accounting inputs/outputs, including total ERs and the grid emission factor. While the extracted record shows no material findings and no corrective actions, the contradictions make it harder to independently reconcile what was actually validated/verified.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing dual-claim channel risk

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory ER totals and grid emission factor values across validation report versions

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of claims being used simultaneously in CORSIA-related contexts. Nonetheless, over-crediting/claims risk remains because different validation report versions disagree on total ERs (281,345 vs 64,883) and the grid emission factor (0.62286 vs 0.82), both of which can materially change credited volumes. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Multiple document types were available (monitoring report, validation report, PDD) with high extraction confidence and 13 documents used

- Project record shows internal inconsistencies (including even the crediting period), which undermines document reliability despite availability

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the extracted record includes a monitoring report, validation report, and PDD, with 13 documents used and high extraction confidence. The record also indicates no material findings and no corrective actions required. However, the presence of multiple contradictions across documents (including crediting period and key quantification parameters) suggests version control and record consistency issues that reduce documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
Leakage	Leakage inconsistently addressed
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards/grievance inconsistently documented; no FPIC
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled, version-controlled quantification package that explains changes between validation report versions (ER totals, grid emission factor, and crediting period) and clearly identifies the final values used for issuance

→ Provide a clear leakage assessment consistent across monitoring reports, including whether leakage is applicable, the justification, and any deduction applied (even if 0%)

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-0198D1B5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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