

QUALITY REPORT

70 MW Bhadla Solar power plant by Fortum Finnsurya Energy Pvt Ltd (EKIESL-CDM-APRIL 16-01)

GS-1371 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-AD8371B6 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a recognized methodology, but the evidence base is weakened by unresolved leakage treatment, unclear reversal handling, and several verification findings. Transparency is moderate because multiple official documents are available, yet key operational details such as usage monitoring, grid factors, and some eligibility fields are not stated in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1371
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 17.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2024
VVB	KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	201,309 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the verification record, despite an earlier document suggesting it was negligible.
- The verification process raised multiple CARs and CLs, and the record notes missing generation data for April and May.
- Reversal events are not clearly resolved, while the monitoring record mentions several plant breakdowns during the period.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

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

- Leakage is not addressed in the later verification report, and the record also notes several breakdown events during the monitoring period.

The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test, which supports the project's core crediting logic. However, leakage is recorded as not addressed in the later verification report, and the monitoring period notes several operational breakdowns that could affect confidence in delivered reductions. The project also has no buffer pool information or clear reversal treatment in the extracted record, which weakens permanence-related assurance for a crediting project.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including a PDD, verification report, and monitoring report, with a named VVB.

- Key monitoring details are not stated in the extracted record, including usage monitoring, grid emission factors, and verified usage rates.

Transparency is helped by the presence of a PDD, verification report, and monitoring report, plus a named VVB and a defined monitoring period. That said, several key fields are not stated in the extracted record, including usage monitoring method, verified usage rate, grid emission factors, and CORSIA/CCP status. The verification report also records missing generation data for April and May, which reduces confidence in the completeness of the public MRV trail.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project uses ACM0002 Version 17.0, which is a recognized methodology for grid-connected renewable electricity.

- The claimed and verified emission reductions differ materially, and leakage justification is inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is mixed because the project uses a standard grid-connected renewable methodology, but the evidence does not show a robust leakage treatment in the later verification record. The claimed and verified emission reductions are materially different, which raises over-crediting concerns even though the exact reason for the gap is not fully explained in the extracted facts. With CORSIA eligibility and CCP status not stated, dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available record.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ The record includes a substantial document set and 20 extracted facts, with a medium extraction confidence level.

- The verification report contains several CARs and CLs, and some issues were only resolved after follow-up corrections.

Documentation quality is moderate: the record draws on multiple official documents and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low. At the same time, the verification process raised multiple CARs and CLs, including missing generation data and meter calibration details, although these were later closed. The crediting period and monitoring period are both available, but the contradiction between older and newer documents on the crediting period shows that the record requires careful interpretation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal treatment clearly documented
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed in later verification
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance present, but partial detail
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and reconcile the differing leakage statements across documents.

→ Publish complete monitoring evidence for the missing months, meter calibration records, and explicit reversal/permanence treatment.

Documents Reviewed

- MR GS GS5519.pdf
- GS_5519_MR_ver03_Final_28.02.2024.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_06-11-2017 to 01-04-2019_v02.pdf
- GS_5519_MR_ver04_TC_01.05.2024 Clean.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_06-11-2017 to 01-04-2019_v02.pdf
- 5519_MR_MP04_ver02 - Clean.pdf
- GS_5519_Annual Report_2022-23_26.12.2023.pdf
- 10403_CDM_MR_MP03_Ver02 - Clean.pdf
- GS_5519_MR_v05_04.09.2023_Cleaned(1).pdf
- GS Passport_09-01-2018.pdf
- 5519_TRF_V02 - Clean.pdf
- 5519_RCP_PDD_V03_Clean(1).pdf
- PDD_04-08-2017.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1371
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1371
- FVR 5519_RCP_TQC 25122(2).pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_06-11-2017 to 01-04-2019_v02.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_06-11-2017 to 01-04-2019_v02.pdf
- 5519_FVR.pdf
- FVeR_GS 5519_ITR1_Cleaned(1).pdf
- 10403_CDM FVR_MP03_Ver02.pdf
- Final GS Verification report- 70 MW.pdf

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-AD8371B6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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