QUALITY REPORT

National Solar Power Development Programme, India

CNN-76fe63 · CAR · India

Report ID: CM-38C917F0 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	4.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.4
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
	Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected solar avoidance project verified by Bureau Veritas with no material findings reported, but several core integrity elements are weakly evidenced in the extracted record. Leakage is not addressed and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, increasing over-crediting uncertainty. CORSIA is explicitly not eligible, which reduces aviation-claim risk, but safeguards documentation is inconsistent across documents.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CNN-76fe63
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2013
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. 17
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Verified ERs	67,369 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in available documents.
- ■ Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated.
- ■ Safeguards disclosure is contradictory between the validation report (2012) and monitoring report (2026).
- ■ Large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions (76,476 vs 67,369) indicates MRV/quantification uncertainty.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring report (2026).

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report (2026), and no leakage deduction is stated.

The monitoring report (2026) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, but the type of additionality test is not stated in the extracted record, limiting robustness assessment. The baseline is project-specific under AMS-I.D. (version 17), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated, which weakens confidence that the baseline remains conservative over time. Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the monitoring report (2026), which is a notable integrity gap even for grid-connected renewables where leakage is often argued negligible.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance).

- The monitoring report (2026) shows a sizable difference between claimed and verified ERs (76,476 vs 67,369).

The project identifies the VVB (Bureau Veritas Certification) and provides a long monitoring period (2012-07-15 to 2020-12-31) in the monitoring report (2026), supporting traceability. However, the monitoring report (2026) shows claimed ERs of 76,476 versus verified ERs of 67,369, suggesting quantification adjustments that should be clearly explained to users. Some MRV-relevant fields (such as the usage monitoring method) are not stated in the extracted record, reducing transparency on how generation/exports were measured.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible in the monitoring report (2026).

- Baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, increasing over-crediting risk.

CORSIA eligibility is explicitly false in the monitoring report (2026), lowering the risk of aviation-related double-claiming. CCP status is not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess alignment with CCP-style quality screens. Over-crediting risk remains moderate because the baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, and because leakage treatment is absent rather than explicitly justified as negligible.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Document set is relatively complete (7 documents including PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Safeguards information is inconsistent between the validation report (2012) and monitoring report (2026).

The evidence set includes issuance, validation report, monitoring report, and PDD, with 7 documents used and high extraction confidence, which supports document completeness. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the monitoring report (2026), which is a positive signal for audit closure. Nonetheless, safeguards-related disclosure is inconsistent across documents, which reduces confidence in the completeness and consistency of non-carbon documentation.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB confirms additionality, but test type not evidenced
Permanence	Avoidance renewable project with no reversal events reported
Leakage	Leakage not addressed and no deduction stated
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
Safeguards	No FPIC or grievance mechanism documented; safeguards inconsistent
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment (even if negligible) and state the applied leakage deduction, with justification in the monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Disclose the specific additionality test applied (e.g., investment/barrier/common practice) and provide supporting calculations or evidence referenced by the VVB.

→ Clarify baseline update/reassessment approach and timing for the grid emission factor and baseline parameters over the monitoring period.

Documents Reviewed

- approval
- authorization
- 15 Jul 2012 - 31 Dec 2020
- POA registration request form
- POA design document
- CPA design document
- Validation report

Report ID: CM-38C917F0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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