

QUALITY REPORT

13.95 MW grid connected wind electricity generation by SRF Limited

VCS-821 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-E9526F20 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.4
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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 leaves important gaps on leakage treatment, permanence handling, and baseline reassessment. The project has some safeguard evidence, yet the monitoring report also shows multiple corrective actions and a contradiction on the crediting period that reduces confidence in the documentation trail.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-821
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D. 13
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	154,757 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record.
- The monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including double-counting, commissioning date, and grievance register issues.
- A contradiction exists on the crediting period between the monitoring report and the PDD, which weakens reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.4 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring report.
- Leakage justification is not addressed, and reversal events are not addressed in the extracted record.

The monitoring report confirms additionality through an investment test and says the VVB verified it, which supports the project's core integrity case. However, leakage justification is not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not found, and reversal events are not addressed in the extracted record, so permanence and leakage controls remain weakly evidenced. The project also uses a project baseline, but no baseline reassessment date is stated in available documents.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + A named VVB is identified, and the monitoring period is clearly stated in the monitoring report.
- Total ERs claimed are not stated, and the record does not provide a usage monitoring method or registry completeness details.

The record identifies the VVB as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) and gives a clear monitoring period from 2012-03-16 to 2018-02-28. Still, total ERs claimed are not stated, the usage monitoring method is not found, and the extracted record does not show a complete registry trail. These gaps limit how fully an outside reviewer can reconstruct the issuance basis.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- + The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of double-claim risk.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and leakage treatment is missing.

Claim safety is helped by the fact that the project is marked not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers one route to overlapping claims. But the baseline remains project-specific, leakage treatment is missing, and the monitoring report includes corrective actions related to double counting and emission reduction sheet cross-checks. That combination leaves a meaningful over-crediting and claim-quality concern.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance record.
- The monitoring report lists several corrective actions, and extraction confidence is not an issue, but the crediting period contradiction still weakens the record.

Documentation is reasonably broad, with evidence drawn from the issuance record, PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, and the extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including missing host-country authorization, turbine location details, and double-counting declarations, which suggests the file was not fully clean. The crediting period also conflicts between the monitoring report and the PDD, so I privileged the later monitoring report because it is more recent and operationally specific.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance noted, but inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear leakage assessment and, if applicable, a quantified deduction with justification.

→ Publish a reconciled issuance package that resolves the crediting-period contradiction and closes the corrective actions on double counting, commissioning date, and grievance records.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification 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-E9526F20 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy