

QUALITY REPORT

IND/REC/HYD/ICR/21072025/00015

OG-687dd2b4 · ICR · India Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-72B4A8EA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project facts beyond basic metadata, with low extraction confidence and no source documents captured. As a result, additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and MRV quality cannot be substantiated, creating a high risk of over-crediting and weak defensibility of claims.

Project Details

Registry	ICR
Registry ID	OG-687dd2b4
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, or monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, increasing the risk that critical details were missed.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions are not stated in the extracted record because no documents were available.

~ The project is labeled as renewable energy avoidance, but the absence of baseline and monitoring details prevents assessing over-crediting risk.

No project documents were captured in the extracted record, so the baseline method, any baseline reassessment timing, and the additionality test (and whether a VVB confirmed it) are not stated. Leakage treatment (including any deduction or justification), permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool), and any material findings or corrective actions are also not found in the extracted record. Given these evidence gaps, integrity cannot be substantiated and is scored very low.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or claimed vs verified ER information is available in the extracted record.

- Registry/public documentation completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

The extracted record provides no verification/monitoring report details (such as VVB name, monitoring period, or claimed versus verified emission reductions). With zero documents used and low extraction confidence, MRV transparency and registry completeness cannot be evaluated from the available evidence. This results in a very low transparency score (noting that a documentation score below 3.0 would cap transparency under the gate rules).

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and any safeguards against double claiming are not stated in the extracted record.

~ Without baseline and grid/emission factor details, the risk of inflated avoidance credits cannot be evaluated.

Key claim-safety indicators—such as CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, and any quantified parameters that drive avoidance crediting (e.g., grid emission factor approach or other baseline inputs)—are not stated in the extracted record. Because the project is in renewable energy avoidance, missing baseline and monitoring specifics materially increase greenwashing and over-crediting risk. Claim safety is therefore scored low due to lack of substantiating evidence.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- No evidence documents were captured and 0 documents were used, indicating severe documentation gaps.

- Extraction confidence is low, reducing reliability even for any partial text that may have been present.

The extracted record shows 0 documents used and an empty evidence document list, meaning the underlying PDD/monitoring/verification reports were not available for assessment. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability. These factors justify a very low documentation score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found in extracted record
● Permanence	Avoidance type, but permanence provisions not documented
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found in extracted record
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated in extracted record
● Safeguards	No safeguards/FPIC/grievance info found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports (including VVB name, monitoring period, and claimed vs verified ERs) so baseline, additionality, and MRV can be assessed.
- Disclose baseline parameters and leakage assessment (including any deduction and justification), plus any safeguards documentation (FPIC/grievance) and CORSIA/CCP status to reduce claim-risk.

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-72B4A8EA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy