QUALITY REPORT

Wind Power Project By M/S Chhotabhai Jethabhai Patel & Co. (CJP) At Sinnar, Maharashtra

VCS-870 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-0ADC9E76 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	6.0
Claim Safety (25%)	6.4
Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected wind power project using a small-scale renewable electricity methodology, with emissions reductions fully matched between claimed and verified totals for the monitored period. However, multiple documentation inconsistencies (leakage treatment, safeguards mention, and crediting period dates) and several corrective actions in the monitoring report reduce confidence in data reliability and governance quality.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-870
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. 13
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	TUV Rheinland Japan Ltd.
Verified ERs	5,084 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2010
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Conflicting statements across documents on leakage treatment ("not applicable" vs "deemed negligible") and on whether safeguards are mentioned

■ Crediting period dates differ between the monitoring report and the PDD, creating uncertainty about the exact crediting timeline

■ Monitoring report required multiple corrective actions, including missing outage details, measurement frequency, monitoring point diagram, and a meter calibration certificate

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation report).

- Leakage is not consistently treated across documents and no leakage deduction percentage is stated in the extracted record (monitoring report vs validation report).

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation documentation indicates an investment test and confirms additionality by the VVB (validation report). The baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which is a moderate integrity weakness for an avoidance renewable project (extracted record). Leakage is treated inconsistently across documents and no explicit leakage deduction percentage is provided in the extracted record, which increases uncertainty around completeness of accounting (monitoring report; validation report).

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Claimed and verified emissions reductions match at 5,084 tCO2e for the monitoring period 2009-03-30 to 2010-09-15 (monitoring report).

- MRV transparency is weakened by multiple corrective actions requested on monitoring completeness and metering evidence (monitoring report).

The monitoring report clearly states the monitoring period (2009-03-30 to 2010-09-15) and the verified emissions reductions equal the claimed amount (5,084 tCO2e), which supports basic transparency of results (monitoring report). However, the monitoring report lists several corrective actions related to monitoring descriptions, outage reporting, measurement frequency, monitoring point diagrams, and meter calibration evidence, indicating MRV documentation quality issues at the time of verification (monitoring report). The VVB is identified as TÜV Rheinland Japan Ltd., which supports traceability of assurance (extracted record).

Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (extracted record).

- Over-crediting risk is harder to rule out because baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents (extracted record).

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of problematic aviation-related claims (extracted record). Claim safety is still moderated by uncertainty around leakage treatment ("not applicable" vs "deemed negligible") and the absence of a stated leakage deduction percentage in the extracted record, which can create perceived over-crediting risk even if impacts are small for wind projects (monitoring report; validation report). The baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents, which also limits confidence in conservativeness over time (extracted record).

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Key documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is high (extracted record).

- Internal consistency issues across documents (leakage, safeguards mention, crediting period) reduce documentation reliability (multiple documents).

The extracted record includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, and the minimum extraction confidence is high, indicating the underlying documents were readable and key sources exist (extracted record). Documentation quality is weakened by the number and nature of corrective actions required in the monitoring report, including provision of a calibration certificate and adding missing monitoring details (monitoring report). Cross-document inconsistencies (leakage framing, safeguards mention, and crediting period dates) further reduce confidence in document control and consistency (PDD; validation report; monitoring report).

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
Leakage	Inconsistent treatment; deduction not stated
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistently documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear, consistent leakage statement across PDD/validation/monitoring, including an explicit leakage deduction (even if 0%) with justification aligned to the applied methodology.

→ Resolve and document the correct crediting period dates consistently across the PDD, validation, and monitoring/verification documentation, with an explanation for any revision.

→ Strengthen MRV documentation by permanently incorporating the corrective-action items (outage logs, measurement frequency, monitoring point diagram, and meter calibration certificates) into monitoring templates and public reports.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification 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-0ADC9E76 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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