QUALITY REPORT

Wind Energy Project By Ramco Group In India

VCS-669 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-8392E90F · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS wind power project using ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB, which supports baseline and additionality credibility. However, leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports and key emissions reduction figures conflict across documents, increasing over-crediting and reliability concerns. Social safeguards (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are not evidenced in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-669
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 10
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Verified ERs	661,206 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Conflicting emissions reduction numbers across documents (claimed and verified figures vary by report/date), undermining confidence in credited volumes.

■ Leakage is alternately described as “deemed negligible” and “not addressed,” with no quantified leakage deduction stated.

■ Multiple corrective action requests (seven CARs) indicate MRV/control weaknesses during verification/assessment.

■ No evidence found for FPIC, grievance mechanism, or benefit-sharing arrangements.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation in the extracted record).

- Leakage is inconsistently handled and not quantified (monitoring reports show “deemed negligible” vs “not addressed,” and no leakage deduction is stated).

The project applies ACM0002 (version 10) with a project-specific baseline approach, and the extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB via an investment test (validation/verification documentation). Leakage is a key weakness: one monitoring report (2011-05-09) deems leakage negligible, while a later monitoring report (2014-10-17) indicates leakage was not addressed, and no leakage deduction percentage is provided. No buffer pool contribution or reversal information is found in the extracted record; while wind is an avoidance project with low reversal risk, the absence of explicit statements still leaves an evidence gap. The presence of multiple corrective action requests suggests implementation/MRV issues that can affect integrity if not fully resolved.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ Named independent VVB (Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS) and a clearly stated monitoring period (2011-04-01 to 2013-06-30).

- ERR figures are inconsistent across reports/dates, reducing MRV transparency and traceability.

The monitoring period is clearly stated (2011-04-01 to 2013-06-30) and the VVB is identified as Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS, which supports audit traceability. However, the extracted record shows substantial inconsistencies in emissions reduction figures across documents and dates, making it difficult to reconcile what was claimed versus what was ultimately verified. Leakage treatment is also inconsistent across monitoring reports, further reducing clarity on accounting choices. Overall transparency is moderate due to these internal inconsistencies despite decent document coverage.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

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

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory claimed/verified ERR values and unclear leakage treatment.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of aviation-related double-claiming channels. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity label claims. Over-crediting/greenwashing risk is elevated because key ERR numbers conflict across validation/verification documents and leakage is not consistently justified or quantified. The baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated, which adds uncertainty for long crediting periods.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ Good document coverage (9 documents used; includes monitoring, validation, and issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Numerous corrective action requests (CAR 3.2-1 through CAR 3.4-2) suggest documentation/control gaps that required remediation.

The extracted record indicates 9 documents were used and includes monitoring, validation, issuance, and an additional unknown document type; extraction confidence is high, which supports completeness. The most recent document date shown is 2014-10-17 (monitoring report), and the monitoring period sits within the 2006-2016 crediting period, which is plausible. However, seven corrective action requests are listed, indicating that documentation and/or controls required significant follow-up. Several important fields (buffer pool, leakage deduction percentage, baseline reassessment timing, safeguards) are not evidenced in the extracted record, limiting documentation strength.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project but reversal/buffer not evidenced
● **Leakage**	Inconsistent treatment; no quantified deduction
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	No FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing evidenced
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled ERR table linking each document (validation/verification/issuance) to final claimed vs verified totals, explaining any revisions across 2011/2012/2015 figures.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment under ACM0002 for the monitored period, including a clear justification and a stated leakage deduction (even if 0%) consistent across monitoring reports.

→ Disclose safeguards evidence (FPIC process, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing/community engagement) in project documentation or monitoring reports.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation 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-8392E90F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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