QUALITY REPORT

VCS Grouped Project For Renewable Power Generation By Essel Mining And Industries Limited

VCS-1497 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-50D1D57C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.4
	Transparency (25%)	6.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
	Documentation (15%)	7.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS renewable electricity grouped project with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no material findings reported, but several MRV corrections were required and key baseline/leakage parameters are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record. Contradictory figures for claimed/verified emission reductions across documents and inconsistent treatment of safeguards weaken confidence and increase over-crediting and reputational risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1497
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 16.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2024
VVB	VKU Certification
Verified ERs	285,158 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	33 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Contradictory emission reduction totals across validation/monitoring documents (285,158 vs 333,062), indicating data reliability issues.
- ■ Corrective actions note inappropriate inclusion of “deemed generation” as export for captive plants, a direct over-crediting risk if not fully corrected.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).

- Leakage is not addressed in the latest monitoring record and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, weakening baseline/leakage robustness (monitoring report, 2024-10-07).

The validation/verification documentation in the extracted record indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (VKU Certification), which supports additionality. However, the latest monitoring report does not address leakage and no leakage deduction is evidenced, and the baseline is described only as project-specific with no stated reassessment date (monitoring report, 2024-10-07). Integrity is further pressured by the monitoring report's corrective actions highlighting that deemed generation for captive plants was inappropriately treated as export for baseline emissions, a classic pathway to inflated ERs if not fully corrected (monitoring report, 2024-10-07).

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ Claimed and verified ER match in the extracted record (285,158), and the VVB is identified as VKU Certification.

- Extensive corrective actions were required to fix monitoring period dates, meter readings/invoices consistency, and ER calculation issues (monitoring report, 2024-10-07).

The project identifies the VVB (VKU Certification) and provides a monitoring period in the extracted record, and the extracted totals show claimed ER equals verified ER at 285,158. Transparency is weakened by the volume and seriousness of corrective actions required, including corrections to monitoring period dates, ER calculation values, calibration details, and reconciliation of generation data against joint meter readings and invoices (monitoring report, 2024-10-07). Key quantification inputs such as grid emission factor and its vintage are not found in the extracted record, limiting independent reproducibility.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (registry extract).

- Documented risk of over-crediting from deemed generation treatment and inconsistent ER totals across documents (monitoring report, 2024-10-07; validation reports dated 2023-01-17 and 2024-11-05).

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation claims based on these credits (registry extract). Nonetheless, the monitoring report documents issues that can directly drive over-crediting—especially the inappropriate inclusion of deemed generation for captive plants and mismatches between reported generation and meter/invoice evidence—raising greenwashing and over-crediting risk if any residual errors remain (monitoring report, 2024-10-07). Claim safety is also reduced by contradictory ER totals across documents, which complicates clear, defensible claims.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 21 documents used.

- Multiple contradictions between older validation and newer monitoring documents on safeguards/FPIC/grievance and ER totals reduce reliability of the documentary record.

The extracted record references a broad evidence set (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 21 documents used and high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation baseline. However, the need for numerous corrective actions suggests earlier versions of the monitoring documentation were not decision-grade until corrected (monitoring report, 2024-10-07). In addition, contradictions between older validation documentation and newer monitoring documentation on safeguards/FPIC/grievance and benefit sharing reduce confidence in the consistency of the project narrative over time.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversal risk evidenced
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed in latest MR
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment not evidenced
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent over time
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, consistent leakage assessment (and any deduction, even if 0%) aligned to ACM0002 and reconcile why older monitoring claimed negligible leakage while the latest record does not address it.

→ Publish a consolidated ER reconciliation note showing how the project moved from 333,062 to 285,158 (including treatment of deemed generation and meter/invoice mismatches) with final VVB-verified calculation spreadsheets and evidence references.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Confidential
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation

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-50D1D57C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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