

## QUALITY REPORT

# Bundled Wind Power generation project by Savita Oil Technologies Ltd., India

VCS-891 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-1FB2CA1C · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.5**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>4.8</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.2</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.0</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.1</b>

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 evidence record shows several unresolved monitoring and accounting issues. The main concerns are inconsistent emissions-reduction figures across documents, leakage not being addressed in the latest monitoring report, and incomplete clarity on safeguards and monitoring procedures.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-891
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 16.0
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	TUV SUD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Verified ERs	26,030 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

## Red Flags

- The latest monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, while an earlier report treated it as negligible.
- There are major inconsistencies in emissions-reduction totals across validation and monitoring documents, including 26,030 versus 88,358 and 30,096.
- The monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including calibration gaps, substation changes, and missing supporting records.
- The project is not CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the validation report.

- The latest monitoring report does not address leakage, and the record shows no buffer pool or reversal detail.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test and the VVB is identified as TUV SUD South Asia Pvt Ltd, which supports the project's core integrity case. However, the monitoring report states leakage is not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not found in the extracted record, and reversal handling is not addressed, which weakens permanence and leakage confidence. The project is a wind power activity, so permanence risk is lower than for land-use projects, but the documentation still leaves important accounting gaps.

### Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The project has named verification coverage from TUV SUD South Asia Pvt Ltd and a defined monitoring period in the monitoring report.

- The monitoring report includes several corrective actions and inconsistencies, including mismatched monitoring-period references and missing calibration evidence.

The project has a named verifier and a clearly stated monitoring period in the monitoring report, which helps transparency. At the same time, the report lists multiple corrective actions, including unclear calibration frequency, missing calibration certificates, and a mismatch between the summary sheet and the stated monitoring period. The record also shows no usage-monitoring method and no grid emission factor details in the extracted facts, limiting public MRV clarity.

### Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly marked not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces some dual-market claim risk.

- Emissions-reduction figures are inconsistent across documents, and the latest report leaves leakage justification unresolved.

Claim safety is weakened by contradictory emissions-reduction figures across documents: the monitoring report claims 26,030, while validation records also show 30,096 and 88,358 in different places. I privileged the latest monitoring report for the claimed amount and the later validation figure for the verified amount because they are more recent and closer to issuance, but the spread still signals reliability risk. The latest monitoring report also says leakage is not addressed, which increases over-crediting concern even though the project is not CORSIA-eligible.

### Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were available, including validation, monitoring, and issuance records, and extraction confidence is high.

- The monitoring report still requires several follow-up submissions and clarifications, showing incomplete documentation quality.

Documentation breadth is moderate because the record includes validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance documents, and extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report itself lists many outstanding items, including calibration certificates, ER sheet support, and clarification of substation changes and apportioning procedures. The crediting period also differs between the PDD and the later monitoring report, so the file is not fully internally consistent.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal detail or buffer evidence
● <b>Leakage</b>	Latest report leaves leakage unaddressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Grievance mechanism present, FPIC not shown
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions-reduction schedule that explains all differences between the monitoring, validation, and issuance figures.

→ Submit the missing calibration certificates, clarify leakage treatment, and document the safeguard process including FPIC and stakeholder consultation records.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Validation 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-1FB2CA1C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)