

QUALITY REPORT

GHG abatement through Solar Power Generation at Jaisalmer, Rajasthan, India

GS-1381 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-644EEBE0 · Generated: 2026-04-24 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths (Gold Standard registration, VVB verification of additionality by Applus+), but suffers from multiple documentation gaps, unresolved monitoring/record-keeping issues and contradictory statements on leakage and reversal treatment. These issues reduce confidence in emission reduction reliability and increase risk of over-crediting.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1381
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS.I.D 3.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2023
VVB	Applus+ Certification
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-24

Red Flags

- Leakage justification is inconsistently reported (documents state both 'deemed negligible' and 'not addressed').
- Multiple corrective actions and missing core monitoring evidence (commission certificate, technical manual, generation logs, calibration certificates).
- Key MRV figures (total ER claimed/verified) and grid EF provenance not provided in extracted records.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB (verification report by Applus+).

- Leakage justification not addressed in the latest available document and baseline reassessment timing not stated — raises leakage and baseline validity concerns.

Additionality was tested via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (verification report by Applus+), which supports basic additionality. However, the project uses a project-specific baseline (AMS.I.D) with no documented recent reassessment of the baseline and leakage justification is not clearly addressed in the latest extracted records. Multiple material findings and numerous corrective actions (missing commissioning certificate, missing calibration certificates, incomplete generation records) indicate weaknesses in monitoring and increase the risk that reported ERs are not robust.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ Project uses Gold Standard registry and lists a monitoring period (2021-01-01 — 2023-10-30).

- Core MRV outputs (total emission reductions claimed/verified, FN/RB method/value, usage monitoring) are not stated in available documents.

The project is registered on Gold Standard and a monitoring period (2021-01-01 — 2023-10-30) is provided. The VVB is named (Applus+). Nonetheless, critical public-facing data are missing from the extracted record: total emission reductions claimed and verified are not stated, FN/RB method and value are absent, and evidence documents are labelled 'unknown'. Extraction confidence is medium, which further reduces transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

+ Uses an established methodology (AMS.I.D, version 3.0) and reports a grid emission factor value (0.948).

- Evidence of ER rounding not conservative and many missing monitoring records increase over-crediting risk.

There is a material over-crediting risk: the MR notes that ER values were not rounded down conservatively and several monitoring records needed for cross-checks are missing. Although a grid emission factor (0.948) is provided and an established methodology is used, missing usage monitoring and FN/RB details and unresolved corrective actions weaken confidence in claimed reductions and increase greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ Fifteen documents were used and VVB name and verification actions are recorded (Applus+).

- Many corrective actions remain or were raised during verification; evidence documents are listed as 'unknown' and extraction confidence is only medium.

Fifteen documents were used and the verification is recent in the extracted record (doc_date 2024-11-12), but the evidence_docs are not identified and extraction confidence is medium. Numerous corrective actions were raised in verification (many relating to missing core documents and monitoring records). These gaps reduce the documentation score and suggest shortcomings in record quality and completeness.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	no buffer info; reversals none reported
● Leakage	inconsistent/no justification
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	safeguards mentioned; FPIC unclear
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and publish missing MRV evidence: total ER claimed/verified, calibration certificates, commissioning certificate, full generation logs and joint meter readings.

→ Clarify and document leakage justification and baseline reassessment timing; resolve contradictions by issuing a clear, dated statement in monitoring/verification reports.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_monitoring period_01-09-2017 to 01-02-2020_v2.pdf
- GS 6003 Annual Report 2024.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_31.10.2013 to 31.08.2017_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-09-2017 to 01-02-2020_v2.pdf
- GS MR PTPL V03 04082020- Clean.pdf
- GS Passport_09.04.2017_v1.pdf
- GS Passport_03.01.2018_v3.pdf
- GS Passport 13.11.2017_v2.pdf
- PDD_07.18.2012_v3.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1381
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1381
- Verification Report_monitoring period_01-09-2017 to 01-02-2020.pdf
- FVR-0420- Clean- final.pdf
- Validation Report 22.09.2017.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_13.02.2016 to 31.08.2017_v2.2.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-09-2017 to 01-02-2020_v2.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_31.10.2013 to 31.08.2017_v1.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-644EEBE0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-24 · Generated: 2026-04-24

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