

QUALITY REPORT

Solar PV Power Project by MMPL in Fatepur, Gujarat

CNN-9212d8 · CAR · India

Report ID: CM-1104293D · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality elements (baseline, additionality, monitoring, and safeguards) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high due to lack of verifiable evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CNN-9212d8
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2013
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, and monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or incorrect facts.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.2 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record due to missing documentation.

~ Renewable energy avoidance projects typically have low permanence risk, but permanence provisions (e.g., any buffer or reversal handling) are not evidenced here.

No PDD, monitoring report, or verification report was captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage assessment, and any material findings/corrective actions cannot be confirmed. For an avoidance renewable project, permanence risk is usually limited, but no documentation was available to confirm how non-performance or operational interruptions are handled. Given the complete evidence gap, integrity is scored very low.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB identity, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed ER information was found in the extracted record.

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

The extracted record contains no VVB name, monitoring period, or quantified claimed-versus-verified emission reductions because no documents were available. With low extraction confidence and no sources listed, MRV transparency and registry completeness cannot be substantiated. This results in a very low transparency score (note: documentation is also very low, which would trigger a transparency cap under the gate rules).

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline method, grid emission factor/FNRB approach (if relevant), and monitoring/verification results are not evidenced.

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unclear.

Without baseline and monitoring/verification documentation, there is no basis to judge whether credited reductions are conservative or whether grid/baseline parameters were applied correctly. Eligibility indicators (e.g., CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, leaving double-claim/market-eligibility risk unresolved. The absence of verifiable ER figures materially increases greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used and no evidence documents were listed, indicating a major evidence gap.

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability of any absent/implicit information and suggests potential unreadable sources.

No evidence documents were listed and zero documents were used, indicating the assessment is operating without primary sources (PDD, verification, monitoring). The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the likelihood of missing critical information. Documentation quality is therefore extremely weak.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Avoidance type but not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports so baseline selection, additionality testing, and quantified verified ERs can be checked.

→ Disclose VVB details, monitoring period dates, any findings/corrective actions, and registry/eligibility status (e.g., CORSIA/CCP) to reduce claim and double-claim risk.

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-1104293D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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