

QUALITY REPORT

13.25 MW Wind Power Generation By Rmtl, In Kutch, Gujarat

VCS-631 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-B3D05EC7 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.7Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	3.1
■ Transparency (25%)	4.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.5
■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signals (VVB confirmation of additionality, named VVB, monitoring period and verified ERR), but important gaps and contradictions reduce confidence. Baseline methodology, leakage treatment, and several corrective actions are missing or inconsistent across documents, creating over-crediting and data-reliability risks.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-631
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2014, 2015, 2016
Project Methodology	AMS ID 13
Crediting Period	2009 — 2018
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	81,011 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Contradictory ERR figures between validation and older documents (39,541 vs 81,011 tCO₂e).
- Leakage not consistently addressed (earlier report deems negligible; later report states not addressed).
- Multiple corrective actions required in the verification record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.1 / 10

- baseline method not stated (no project baseline or recent reassessment found in available documents)
- + additionality confirmed by the VVB (validation report)

The verification report confirms additionality and a named VVB (LGAI/Applus+) which supports baseline/additionality credibility. However, no baseline method is stated in the available record and leakage treatment is described as not addressed in the later monitoring report (2021). Multiple corrective actions were required in verification, indicating material weaknesses. These factors lower robustness on additionality, baseline validity and leakage.

Transparency — 4.5 / 10

- + VVB named (LGAI Technological Center, S.A.) and monitoring period documented (monitoring report, 2012–2016)
- contradictory and inconsistent ERR figures between documents (validation report 2021 vs monitoring/validation 2009)

Project-level transparency is mixed: a monitoring period (2012–04–01 to 2016–03–30) and a named VVB are present (monitoring report, validation report), and verified ERR is reported. But there are clear contradictions between documents on total ERR claimed/verified and on safeguards/leakage, and extraction confidence is medium, reducing trust in reported numbers.

Claim Safety — 3.5 / 10

- leakage justification inconsistent: earlier monitoring report deemed leakage negligible (2009) but later monitoring report states leakage not addressed (2021)
- + project not CORSIA-eligible (project record states CORSIA not eligible), reducing one double-claim pathway

CORSIA eligibility is explicitly false (good), which reduces one double-claim risk. Nonetheless, the inconsistent ERR figures (39,541 vs 81,011 tCO₂e across documents) and unresolved leakage justification increase over-crediting risk. FN/RB and usage monitoring are not documented, further elevating claim risk.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

- + multiple evidence documents available (monitoring report and validation report; n_docs_used = 6)
- many corrective actions required listed in verification (CAR 2.1–6.1), and baseline/method gaps remain; extraction confidence is only medium

There are multiple supporting documents (monitoring and validation reports; n_docs_used = 6) and the monitoring report is recent (2021-04-30). However, the extraction confidence is medium and many corrective actions were required by the verifier, suggesting the documentation is incomplete or of limited reliability. Key items such as baseline method and buffer pool percentage are not stated.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB confirmed but test unspecified
● Permanence	no buffer info; reversal risk unclear
● Leakage	not properly addressed
● Baseline	baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA no, CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or clarify the baseline method and most recent baseline reassessment, including methodology references and calculations.

→ Resolve contradictions by issuing an updated monitoring/validation package that reconciles ERR figures, provides a clear leakage assessment/deduction, and documents closure of all corrective actions.

Documents Reviewed

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

Disclaimer

This Quality Report is an independent editorial assessment generated by CarbonMeld's automated analysis pipeline. It is based solely on publicly available registry documents and marketplace metadata at the time of analysis.

CarbonMeld does not have access to non-public project information, internal project documentation, or confidential communications with project developers. The analysis pipeline may not have retrieved all publicly available documents for this project.

This report does not constitute an audit, certification, financial recommendation, investment advice, or guarantee of environmental outcome. It does not replace professional due diligence by the buyer or any party relying on this information.

CarbonMeld is not a registry, certification body, or financial advisor. Scores reflect evidence available at the time of analysis and may change as new documentation becomes available. CarbonMeld shall not be liable for any decision to purchase, sell, trade, or otherwise transact carbon credits based in whole or in part on the scores or content of this report.

Report ID: CM-B3D05EC7 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy