QUALITY REPORT

Wind Power Project At Anthiyur, Tamil Nadu

VCS-682 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-A17EFC6C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.2
Transparency (25%)	6.1
Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
Documentation (15%)	7.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected wind power project under AMS I.D. with investment additionality confirmed by the VVB and matching claimed vs verified ERs in the latest monitoring record. However, multiple internal inconsistencies across documents (including ER totals, leakage treatment, and even the stated crediting period) and numerous corrective actions related to metering/calibration and calculation consistency increase over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-682
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS I.D. 18.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2026
VVB	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	28,782 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	63 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Conflicting ER totals across validation/monitoring documents (10,485 vs 28,782) indicate data reliability issues.

- Leakage is not addressed in the latest monitoring report despite earlier documents deeming it negligible, creating methodological inconsistency.

- Many corrective actions/CARs relate to meter replacement, calibration certificates, and inconsistent parameters/ER calculations, elevating MRV risk.

- Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2006–2016 vs 2016–2026), raising questions about period eligibility and record accuracy.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

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

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent and the latest monitoring report does not address leakage or provide a quantified deduction.

Additionality appears reasonably supported: the validation/verification record indicates an investment test and that the VVB confirmed additionality. Baseline setting is project-specific (not a standardized/jurisdictional baseline) and the extracted record does not show when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens robustness. Leakage is a key gap: the latest monitoring report does not address leakage and no leakage deduction is quantified, despite earlier documentation treating leakage differently.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are present (named VVB, defined monitoring period, and ERs reported for 2023).

- Numerous corrective actions and cross-document inconsistencies reduce confidence in the clarity and reliability of reported data.

The monitoring report (2024-05-28) clearly states the monitoring period (2023-01-01 to 2023-12-31), names the VVB (VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.), and reports ERs with claimed and verified totals aligned in the extracted record. Transparency is undermined by the long list of corrective actions in the monitoring report, including inconsistencies between the monitoring report and ER sheet, meter replacement details, and missing/updated calibration certificates. These issues suggest that while information is present, it required substantial correction and reconciliation.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain double-claiming/eligibility risks.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictions in ER figures and by MR corrections requested for ER calculations and monitoring parameters.

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain aviation-related claims. However, claim safety is weakened by over-crediting risk signals: the monitoring report requests corrections to ER values and inconsistencies between reported parameters and the ER sheet, and there are contradictions in ER totals across validation/monitoring documents. Leakage treatment inconsistency (negligible vs not addressed) further increases the risk that stakeholders could overstate the rigor of emissions accounting.

Documentation — 7.0 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was available (34 documents including PDD, monitoring, validation, and issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- The monitoring report lists multiple CARs/corrective actions, indicating documentation and internal consistency weaknesses at verification.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the extracted record references a PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance records, with 34 documents used and high extraction confidence. Nevertheless, the monitoring report (2024-05-28) includes multiple corrective actions/CARs (including CAR B1–B4 and CAR C1) focused on metering changes, calibration evidence, and calculation consistency, indicating that document quality and internal coherence were not clean on first submission. The presence of an 'unknown' document type in the evidence list also suggests some cataloging/traceability gaps.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed/unclear deduction
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent over time
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note across versions explaining the ER total changes (10,485 vs 28,782) and provide a single authoritative ER table tied to the final ER sheet and verification conclusion.

→ Standardize leakage treatment in the monitoring report (explicitly state negligible leakage with justification under AMS I.D. or apply a quantified deduction) and ensure consistent crediting period statements across all project documents.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Proof of Ownership
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- 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-A17EFC6C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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