

## QUALITY REPORT

# 5.5 MW Bundled Wind Power Project by WMI Cranes Ltd

VCS-662 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-743847CA · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.9**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>4.8</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.2</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.4</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.6</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS wind project with VVB-verified additionality, but the record shows meaningful reliability and crediting inconsistencies. The most serious issue is that the later monitoring/validation documents report higher verified emissions reductions than earlier documents, while leakage is no longer justified and several corrective actions were still open in the documentation trail.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-662
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. 13
Crediting Period	2007 — 2017
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	22,312 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

## Red Flags

- The verified emissions reduction figure changes from 15,645 in the earlier validation record to 22,312 in the later validation record, which raises consistency and over-crediting concerns.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the later monitoring record, and the project file also shows open corrective actions related to the DNA letter, PDD compliance, and investment analysis.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB through an investment test, which is stronger than an unverified claim.

- Leakage is not addressed in the later monitoring record, and no buffer pool or reversal treatment is stated in the extracted documents.

The project has a positive integrity signal because additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the validation record. However, the later monitoring record says leakage is not addressed, and there is no buffer pool or reversal treatment stated in the extracted facts, which weakens permanence and leakage confidence. The open corrective actions on the DNA letter, PDD compliance, and investment analysis also suggest unresolved methodological issues.

### Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ A named VVB is provided, and the monitoring period and crediting period are both stated in the record.

- The documentation contains a major discrepancy in verified emissions reductions between earlier and later validation records, which weakens reporting clarity.

Transparency is moderate because the record identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, and the crediting period. That said, the documentation trail contains a material inconsistency in verified emissions reductions, with the earlier validation record showing 15,645 and the later validation record showing 22,312. This discrepancy reduces confidence in the completeness and consistency of the public record.

### Claim Safety — 4.4 / 10

+ The project is a renewable wind project under VCS, which generally lowers baseline and fossil-fuel displacement risk.

- The later record shows a higher verified emissions reduction than the earlier one, and leakage is not addressed, increasing over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the same emissions-reduction discrepancy, which creates a risk of over-crediting or inconsistent accounting across documents. The project is a wind power activity under VCS, which is generally favorable, but the later monitoring record does not provide a leakage justification and no usage monitoring details are stated. Because the record does not state CORSIA or CCP status, dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted facts.

### Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ Multiple official document types are present, including issuance, PDD, validation, and monitoring records, with high extraction confidence.

- Several corrective actions were still required, including the DNA letter, PDD compliance, and investment analysis documents.

Documentation breadth is fairly good because the extracted record includes issuance, PDD, validation, and monitoring materials, and extraction confidence is high. Still, several corrective actions were required, and the record does not state key items such as buffer pool treatment, leakage deduction, or usage monitoring method. The crediting period also appears inconsistent across documents, which further limits documentation quality.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal treatment stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline stated, reassessment missing
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards present but inconsistently documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and document any deduction or justification in the monitoring report.

→ Resolve the emissions-reduction discrepancy and close the outstanding corrective actions with supporting evidence.

## Documents Reviewed

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

### 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-743847CA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)