

QUALITY REPORT

72 MWac Ramnad Solar Power Project

GS-1427 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-55B0BB94 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.3
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a real, VVB-verified solar project with some positive evidence on additionality and safeguards, but the monitoring record shows multiple corrective actions and several unresolved data gaps. The biggest concerns are weak leakage treatment, inconsistent crediting-period information across documents, and missing verified emissions/usage figures in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1427
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 20.0
Crediting Period	2018 — 2023
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- The monitoring report raised multiple CARs and CLs, including missing generation data and inconsistent net generation and baseline emissions.
- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, while the PDD says it is negligible; the record does not show a quantified deduction.
- The crediting period differs between the monitoring report and the PDD, creating a documentation reliability issue.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by Earthood Services Private Limited, and the validation report indicates a combined additionality test.

- The monitoring report records several CARs and CLs, including inconsistent generation and baseline emission figures, and leakage is not addressed there.

Additionality is reasonably supported because the validation report confirms a combined test and the VVB is identified as Earthood Services Private Limited. However, the monitoring report raised multiple CARs and CLs, including missing generation data and inconsistent net generation and baseline emission values, which weakens confidence in the emissions accounting. Leakage is also weakly supported because the monitoring report says it is not addressed, even though the PDD describes it as negligible.

Transparency — 4.3 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period from 2021-01-01 to 2022-12-31.

- Verified and claimed ERR totals are not stated in the extracted record, and the monitoring report shows missing generation data for several months.

The project has a named verifier and a clearly stated monitoring period, which helps traceability. That said, the extracted record does not provide verified or claimed ERR totals, and the monitoring report flags missing generation data for several months. The absence of quantified FNRB, usage-rate, and emission totals limits public-facing transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

+ The project uses ACM0002 under Gold Standard, which is a recognized methodology for grid-connected renewable power.

- Leakage treatment is weak because the monitoring report does not address it, even though the PDD describes it as negligible; CORSIA eligibility is true, which keeps dual-use risk relevant.

Claim safety is moderate at best because the project uses a standard grid-connected solar methodology, but the evidence base for over-crediting control is incomplete. The PDD says leakage is negligible, while the monitoring report does not address leakage, so the record does not show a robust quantified deduction. CORSIA eligibility is true, which means the project sits in a higher-scrutiny category for claim use.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ The record includes multiple official documents, including the PDD, monitoring report, and validation report, with high extraction confidence.

- The monitoring report lists several corrective actions and inconsistencies, and the crediting period is inconsistent across documents.

Documentation breadth is decent because the record includes the PDD, monitoring report, and validation report, and extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report contains several corrective actions and inconsistencies, including crediting-period and meter-related issues. The crediting period also conflicts between the monitoring report and the PDD, so the documentation is not fully clean.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	Avoidance project with no reversal evidence
● Leakage	Leakage not quantified in monitoring record
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present, but safeguards evidenc
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible status increases dual-use scrutiny

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions statement with verified ERR totals, meter calibration evidence, and complete generation data for all monitoring months.

→ Document leakage treatment, safeguard evidence, and the corrected crediting period in a single consistent set of project records.

Documents Reviewed

- 7080_deviation request form.pdf
- 7080_MR_v05_TC - Clean.pdf
- 7080_annual report.pdf
- Annual Report_GS_7080_2021-22.pdf
- RSPL SCR.pdf
- DEV_272.pdf
- T-PreReview_V1.0-Transition-request-form-project - 7080.pdf
- CDM PDD_RSPL.pdf
- GS PDD_RSPL ver 5.0_TC.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1427
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1427
- Final_FVR GS RCP 7080.QA_ver2_CC.pdf
- (1)Validation Report_GS7080.pdf
- 7080_FVR_v06_CClean.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-55B0BB94 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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