

QUALITY REPORT

Renewable Power Project by Emami Power Ltd

GS-1376 · Gold Standard

Report ID: CM-784DD8E9 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.1
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a certified Gold Standard renewable power project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a documented safeguards process, but the evidence record shows several material inconsistencies and missing MRV details. The largest concern is the large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions, plus unresolved leakage treatment and multiple corrective action requests in the verification report.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1376
Sector	renewable_energy
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	ACM0002 17.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2024
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	37,901 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	25 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- The verification report lists 5 corrective action requests and several missing supporting documents, including meter calibration details and safeguard-related materials.
- There is a major discrepancy between emission reductions claimed and verified, and the contradiction log also shows conflicting crediting period dates across documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.1 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports the project's core eligibility case.
- The verification report records 5 corrective action requests and says leakage was not addressed, while no buffer pool or reversal protection details were found.

The project's integrity is supported by VVB-confirmed additionality through an investment test and a project-specific baseline under ACM0002. However, the verification report lists 5 corrective action requests, including inconsistencies in emission calculations and missing meter calibration and line-diagram evidence, which weakens confidence in the MRV chain. Leakage was explicitly marked as not addressed, and no buffer pool or reversal protection details were found, though permanence risk is inherently lower for an avoidance project.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a verified emissions figure in the verification record.
- The verification report notes missing line diagrams, meter calibration details, and other supporting documents, and the claimed-versus-verified emissions gap is very large.

Transparency is mixed: the record identifies the verifier, monitoring period, methodology, and a verified emissions total, which is helpful. But the verification report also says several supporting documents were missing, including safeguard-related materials and technical metering evidence, and the claimed-versus-verified emissions gap is substantial. The medium extraction confidence also suggests at least one key source was not fully readable, reducing documentation clarity.

Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

- + The project is a renewable power avoidance activity under ACM0002, which is generally lower risk than many removal projects.
- The verified emission reductions are far below the amount claimed, and leakage treatment is not addressed, increasing over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the large difference between emissions claimed and emissions verified, which raises over-crediting concerns. The project uses a project-specific baseline rather than a clearly recent standardized reassessment, and leakage was not addressed in the extracted record. Because this is a renewable electricity avoidance project, the underlying claim is not inherently high risk, but the evidence quality does not fully support a strong safety rating.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, including validation, monitoring, verification, and PDD materials, and the project has a named verifier.
- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report itself lists several missing or inconsistent items that weaken documentation quality.

Documentation is broader than average because multiple official document types were used, including validation, monitoring, verification, and PDD materials. Still, the verification report contains numerous corrective action requests and notes missing sustainability feedback, EHS/social guidelines, safeguard passport information, and ODA support documents. The contradiction between the verification report and the PDD on crediting period dates, plus the discrepancy in verified emissions figures, further reduces confidence in the record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project with no reversal events found
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline with reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance present, but supporting safeguards docs i
● Double-claim	Registry status known, but CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, reconciled MRV package showing how claimed and verified emission reductions were calculated, including meter calibration records and source data.

→ Document leakage treatment, safeguard evidence, and the rationale for the crediting-period dates in a single updated assurance note or verification addendum.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report _VER 03-cleanmode.pdf
- Monitoring Report _1st monitoring period_03.08.2017 to 30.09.2019_v1.pdf
- GS 5830 Annual report .pdf
- ER Sheet_5830_03.xlsx
- ER sheet_Emami GS_25012022.xlsx
- T-PerfCert_V1.1-Annual-Report 5830.pdf
- MR_5830_04_Clean.pdf
- T-V4.0-Deviation-Request-Form-GS 5830_v2_GSdecision.pdf
- 101.5-Transition-Annex-_Emami_-GS5830.pdf
- Transition Request Form-GS 5830_cleanmode.pdf
- T-V4.0-Deviation-Request-Form-GS 5830_v2_GSdecision(1).pdf
- GS5830 Transition Annex.pdf
- GS Passport 08.11.2017_v3.pdf
- GS 5830_PDD_v03.pdf
- GS 5830_PDD_v4.0_CL.pdf
- PDD 24.04.2017_v1.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1376
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1376
- FVR_GS 5830_TQC 14223_Clean_Signed.pdf
- FVR_GS_5830-V02-cleanmode(1).pdf
- FVR Emami GD_5830 GS_RCP_TQC_5624_01.08.2024_AR Sub..pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_03.08.2017 to 30.09.2019_v2.pdf
- FVR Emami GD_5830 GS_RCP_TQC_5624_v3.0_CL.pdf
- GS5830 Validation Report_12.08.2017_v2.pdf
- 01_2017_2617_GS_FVR.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-784DD8E9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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