QUALITY REPORT

72 MWac Kamuthi Renewable Energy Project

GS-1426 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-2A219847 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.4
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
	Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a large renewable energy project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a recent baseline reassessment, which supports the core climate claim. However, the record has several documentation gaps and contradictions, especially around leakage, safeguards, and the crediting period, which reduce confidence in the claim quality.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1426
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2018 — 2023
VVB	TÜV SÜD SOUTH ASIA PVT. LTD.
Verified ERs	246,415 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is not addressed in the monitoring report, while a later validation report says it is negligible.
- The monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions and missing data, including missing generation months and inconsistent meter information.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by TÜV SÜD SOUTH ASIA PVT. LTD. using an investment test, which is stronger than an unverified assertion.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and the record also shows an open corrective action plus missing generation data.

The project benefits from VVB-confirmed additionality through an investment test, and the baseline was reassessed in 2023, which supports the underlying crediting logic. At the same time, the monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, reversal events are not addressed, and one corrective action remains open, all of which weaken integrity confidence. The missing generation data for several months and inconsistent meter information further reduce trust in the emissions accounting.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined 2023 monitoring period, and a recent baseline reassessment in 2023.

- The extracted record does not state claimed emissions reductions, and several monitoring details such as usage monitoring and grid factor inputs are not found.

Transparency is moderate because the project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period from 2023-01-01 to 2023-12-31, and multiple source documents were available. However, the extracted record does not provide the claimed emissions figure, and several operational details such as usage monitoring and grid emission factor inputs are not found in available documents. The monitoring report also notes missing supporting records, which limits auditability.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

+ The methodology is ACM0002, a standard grid-connected renewable electricity approach, and the project is marked CORSIA-eligible.

- Leakage justification is inconsistent across documents, and the project is not shown to be CCP-approved, leaving some residual over-crediting and dual-claim risk.

Claim safety is mixed. The project uses ACM0002 and is marked CORSIA-eligible, which is positive, but the record does not show CCP approval and therefore does not eliminate broader market-claim risk. Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the monitoring report says it is not addressed, while the later validation report says it is deemed negligible, so the safer reading is to discount confidence.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

+ The record draws on multiple document types, including a monitoring report, validation report, and PDD, with high extraction confidence.

- The monitoring report contains several CARs and CLs, plus missing generation months and inconsistent meter and training records.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. There are multiple document types in the evidence set and extraction confidence is high, but the monitoring report includes several CARs and CLs, missing generation months, and requests for additional records such as calibration details and training logs. The crediting period also appears inconsistent across documents, which suggests the file set is not fully clean or harmonized.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● **Leakage**	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● **Baseline**	Project baseline, reassessed in 2023
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance present, but safeguards not fully documen
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled verification package that resolves the leakage, safeguards, and crediting-period contradictions and clearly identifies which document controls each item.

→ Provide complete monitoring evidence for the missing generation months, meter calibration records, and a full emissions calculation sheet with claimed versus verified reductions.

Documents Reviewed

- Annual Report_GS_7079_2021-22.pdf
- 7079_annual report.pdf
- Annual-Report_2024_GS7079.pdf
- 7079_MR_05 - Clean.pdf
- 7079_deviation request form.pdf
- Annual-Report_2023_GS 7079.pdf
- DEV_274.pdf
- CDM- VAL report-GCEES1520.pdf
- 7079_TRF_V02.pdf
- GS PDD_KREL ver 7 clean.pdf
- CDM PDD_KREL.pdf
- GS PDD_KREL ver 3.pdf
- GS7079_RCP_PDD_v03_CL_27-03-2025.pdf
- (1)CDM PDD_KREL.pdf
- GS PDD_KREL.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1426
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1426
- 7079_FVR_05 - Clean.pdf
- Validation Report_GS7079.pdf
- Validation Report-RCP-2_CDM-GS7079_QMR01_TA-V3_CC (3).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-2A219847 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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