QUALITY REPORT

22.5 MW Wind Power Project by Ruchi Soya Industries Limited at Palsodi, District-Ratlam, Madhya Pradesh

VCS-751 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-0E6DA56A · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	4.4
	Transparency (25%)	4.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
	Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a long monitoring history, but the record shows major data consistency problems and weak leakage treatment. The monitoring report also contains multiple corrective-action requests and contradictory emissions figures, which reduce confidence in the claimed reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-751
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 10
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	298,285 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The monitoring report lists several contradictions in export/import values and emission reduction calculations, including a large mismatch between claimed and verified reductions.
- Leakage is not addressed in the later monitoring record, and the project file contains no quantified leakage deduction.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by Earthood Services Private Limited in the validation report, using an investment test.

- The monitoring report flags unresolved calculation issues, meter defects, and a large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions.

The project has a positive integrity signal because additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the validation report through an investment test, and the baseline method is stated as project-based under ACM0002. However, the monitoring report contains numerous corrective actions, including missing supporting documents, meter defects, and inconsistencies in emission reduction calculations, which weaken confidence in the credited volume. Leakage is especially weak because the later monitoring record says it is not addressed, even though the validation report earlier treated it as negligible.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a substantial set of source documents in the extracted record.

- The monitoring report requests missing supporting documents, meter calibration details, and clearer calculation traceability, indicating incomplete MRV disclosure.

Transparency is moderate but not strong. The record identifies the VVB, monitoring period, and registry status, and the project has a substantial document set. At the same time, the monitoring report requests missing invoices, technical specifications, calibration details, and clearer calculation support, showing that the audit trail is incomplete in important places.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of dual-claim risk.

- The later monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, and the record shows contradictory emissions figures across documents.

Claim safety is limited by the combination of a project-specific baseline, unresolved leakage treatment, and contradictory emissions data. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-market risk, but the monitoring report records large discrepancies between claimed and verified reductions and notes that some calculations do not align with the registered PDD. These issues raise over-crediting risk even though the project is a renewable wind installation.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

+ The extracted record includes multiple official documents and the extraction confidence is high.

- The monitoring report itself lists many corrective actions and document gaps, including missing page numbers, supporting invoices, and breakdown records.

Documentation quality is fair overall because multiple official documents are present, the extraction confidence is high, and the VVB is named. Still, the monitoring report itself asks for many corrections and missing attachments, and the record does not state buffer pool coverage or baseline reassessment timing. The presence of extensive corrective actions suggests the documentation package is usable but not clean.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No reversal data or buffer stated
● **Leakage**	Later report leaves leakage unaddressed
● **Baseline**	Project baseline stated, reassessment not found
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism present, but inconsistent histo
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions calculation file that explains the claimed-versus-verified gap and resolves the meter and JMR inconsistencies.

→ Publish a complete leakage and safeguards annex with quantified treatment, supporting invoices, calibration records, and a clear double-counting declaration.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-0E6DA56A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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