

## QUALITY REPORT

# 20 MW Solar Project in Sanwreej, Jodhpur, Rajasthan- Pre CDM Clone

GS-1746 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-B6901B1C · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.5**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected solar project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings, which supports a moderate integrity score. However, leakage treatment is weakly documented, several key MRV fields are not stated in the extracted record, and there is a contradiction on the crediting period and leakage justification that reduces confidence.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1746
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 17.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2024
VVB	EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

## Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the verification record, while another document reportedly described it as negligible; the inconsistency weakens reliability.
- Key MRV details such as verified emissions reductions, usage monitoring, and leakage deduction are not stated in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, and the verification report reports no material findings.
- Leakage justification is not addressed in the verification report, and no leakage deduction is stated.

The verification report from EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited confirms additionality through a combined test and reports no material findings or corrective actions. Baseline method is described as project-based, but the baseline was not shown to have been recently reassessed, and leakage treatment is weak because the verification record says it is not addressed. Reversal risk is not a major issue for a solar electricity project, but the record does not provide a buffer pool or explicit reversal treatment.

### Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a verification report dated 2019-02-12.
- Verified and claimed emissions reduction totals are not stated in the extracted record, and usage monitoring details are missing.

Transparency is moderate because the project has a named verifier, a clear monitoring period from 2017-03-30 to 2018-07-31, and a dated verification report. However, the extracted record does not state verified or claimed emissions reductions, usage monitoring method, or any FNRB method/value, which limits public MRV clarity. The registry is identified as CDM, but the record does not provide enough complete emissions accounting detail to score higher.

### Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project uses ACM0002 for a solar electricity activity, which is a standardised renewable methodology.
- Leakage treatment is unclear and the record contains a contradiction on whether leakage was deemed negligible, increasing over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is middling because the project is a standard grid-connected solar activity under ACM0002, which generally supports conservative accounting. That said, leakage is not addressed in the verification report, and the contradiction notes another document reportedly treated leakage as negligible; I privileged the verification report because it is the more recent and higher-assurance document, but the inconsistency still raises over-crediting risk. No CORSIA or CCP status is stated, so dual-market risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

### Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Multiple document types were used, including validation, monitoring, verification, and PDD sources.
- Minimum extraction confidence is only medium, and several important fields are not stated in available documents.

Documentation is reasonably broad, with validation, monitoring, verification, and PDD documents all represented and seven documents used in extraction. Still, the extraction confidence is only medium, and several key fields are missing rather than merely unspecified, including emissions totals, leakage deduction, and usage monitoring details. The crediting period also conflicts with the PDD version; I privileged the verification report because it is later and reflects the period actually covered by verification.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed combined test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Solar avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards mentioned
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified emissions reduction figures, leakage treatment, and usage monitoring details in a complete MRV package.

→ Resolve the crediting-period and leakage contradictions with a reconciled document trail and clearer version control across PDD, validation, and verification records.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_30.03.2017 to 31.07.2018\_v3.pdf
- LNB\_MR\_ver.\_3\_Track\_Change.pdf
- GS Passport 28.02.2018\_v3.pdf
- PDD 11.07.2017\_v3.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1746
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1746
- Final\_FVR\_\_\_Track\_change.pdf
- Validation Report\_28.02.2018\_v3.pdf
- Verification Report\_1st monitoring period\_30.03.2017 to 31.07.2018\_v4.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-B6901B1C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)