QUALITY REPORT

50 MW (DCR) Nalgonda Solar PV Power Project by Parampujya Solar Energy at Telangana

GS-1436 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-7C457544 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
4.6 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	4.8
	Transparency (25%)	4.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
	Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, the record also shows unresolved leakage treatment, multiple verification corrective actions, and contradictions across documents that reduce confidence in the claimed reductions. Overall, this is a moderately documented project with meaningful reliability concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1436
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 20.0
Crediting Period	2018 — 2023
VVB	VKU Certification Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is not addressed in the verification report, despite an earlier monitoring report saying it was deemed negligible.
- ■ The verification report lists multiple corrective actions and notes inconsistencies in the monitoring period and meter counts.
- ■ The crediting period and additionality-related descriptions differ across documents, creating reliability concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

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

- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the verification report, and the report also records several CARs and CLs.

The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test and names VKU Certification Private Limited as the VVB, which supports the project's core crediting logic. That said, the same report says leakage is not addressed, and it lists multiple CARs and CLs, including requests to clarify the grid emission factor and fix inconsistencies in the monitoring period and meter numbers. These issues weaken confidence in the robustness of the emissions claim.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a recent verification report dated 2025-11-25.

- The verification report says the monitoring period and meter numbers were inconsistent, and verified versus claimed ER totals are not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency is mixed: the project has a defined monitoring period from 2021-01-01 to 2023-11-15 and a recent verification report dated 2025-11-25. However, the extracted record does not provide verified or claimed ER totals, and the report itself notes inconsistencies in the monitoring period and meter data. That limits the ability to independently trace the reported reductions.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

+ The baseline was reassessed in 2023, which is better than an old, unreviewed baseline.

- Leakage treatment is weak because the latest report says it was not addressed, and the project is marked CORSIA-eligible with no CCP status stated.

Claim safety is constrained by the leakage and baseline record. The baseline was last reassessed in 2023, which is a positive sign, but the latest verification report says leakage is not addressed, while an earlier monitoring report had described it as negligible. The project is also marked CORSIA-eligible, and no CCP status is stated, so dual-market claim risk is not fully resolved.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ The record draws on multiple document types, including monitoring, validation, verification, and the PDD.

- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report includes several unresolved documentation requests and corrective actions.

The file set is reasonably broad, with evidence from the monitoring report, validation report, verification report, and PDD, and the project has 17 documents used in extraction. Still, the extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report lists several open documentation requests, including benchmark and IRR calculations, stakeholder consultation records, and updated emission reduction calculations. That suggests the documentation is substantial but not fully clean or complete.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
Leakage	Leakage not addressed in latest verification
Baseline	Project baseline with reassessment timing known
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, reconciled leakage assessment and explain why the latest verification report differs from the earlier monitoring report.

→ Publish the corrected monitoring calculations, meter calibration evidence, and a document trail that resolves the reported inconsistencies in the monitoring period and crediting-period records.

Documents Reviewed

- MR _GS 7139_Version 05.pdf
- Annual-Report_2024_GS7139.pdf
- 7139_MR_V06_Clean.pdf
- Annual Report_GS_7139_2021-22.pdf
- 7139_annual report.pdf
- 7139_deviation request form.pdf
- DEV_271.pdf
- GCEES1820-CDM- VAL report-TLG.pdf
- GS PDD PSEPL_DCR.pdf
- CDM_PDD_PSEPL_DCR.pdf
- GS PDD PSEPL_DCR_V.06_CLEAN.pdf
- GSRCP_50MW_TELANGANA_PDD_V3.0_GS 7139_CC.pdf
- (1)CDM_PDD_PSEPL_DCR.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1436
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1436
- 7139_FVR_V06_Clean(1).pdf
- VKU.F27W.Verification_Report_VKU.VER.47.25_GS_7139.pdf
- Validation Report-RCP-2_CDM-GS7139_CC.pdf
- (1)Validation Report_GS7139.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-7C457544 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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