

QUALITY REPORT

15 MW Solar Photovoltaic Power Project At Gujarat

VCS-1578 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-FA25E9E3 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.4
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	4.3

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

Assessment Summary

This is a solar avoidance project with VVB-verified additionality and no reported leakage deduction, which supports a moderate integrity profile. However, the record has several corrective actions, a project-specific baseline, no stated buffer pool, and weak safeguards documentation, which keeps confidence only moderate.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1578
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2012
Project Methodology	AMS.I.D 17
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	18,207 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Multiple corrective actions were required in the monitoring report, including discrepancies in the ER sheet and incomplete monitoring report aspects.
- Safeguards are weakly documented: no FPIC, no grievance mechanism, and the monitoring report says safeguards were not mentioned.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring report, and the project is an avoidance-type solar project under AMS.I.D.

- The monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, and the baseline is project-specific with no reassessment date stated.

The monitoring report confirms additionality was verified by the VVB, which is a meaningful positive for a VCS solar avoidance project. On the other hand, the project uses a project baseline, the baseline reassessment date is not stated, buffer pool coverage is not found, and reversal handling is marked as not addressed, though reversal risk is inherently limited for solar generation. Multiple corrective actions in the monitoring report, including discrepancies in the ER sheet and incomplete monitoring report aspects, weaken confidence in the robustness of the accounting.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report provides a monitoring period and exact claimed versus verified emission reductions, which match at 18,207 tCO₂e.

- Safeguards are not documented in the monitoring report, and usage monitoring is not stated in the extracted record.

The monitoring report gives a clear monitoring period and reports 18,207 tCO₂e claimed and 18,207 tCO₂e verified, which is a positive sign for MRV consistency. However, usage monitoring is not stated, and the extracted record does not show a complete public-facing safeguards package. The VVB is named as Earthood Services Private Limited, but the overall disclosure quality is only moderate because several operational details are missing.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is a renewable electricity avoidance project with no leakage deduction and a quantified grid emission factor.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and the contradictory crediting-period records reduce confidence in claim precision.

Claim safety is moderate because this is a renewable electricity avoidance project with a quantified grid emission factor and no leakage deduction, which reduces over-crediting concerns. Still, the baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, and the record does not show a recent baseline reassessment. The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-market claim risk, but the contradictory crediting-period entries create some uncertainty about the exact issuance window.

Documentation — 4.3 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance record.

- The extraction confidence is high, but the monitoring report still contains several corrective actions and some key fields are not stated.

The record draws on several official documents, including issuance, PDD, validation, and monitoring materials, which supports a reasonable documentation base. Even so, the monitoring report required multiple corrective actions, and several important items are not stated, including buffer pool coverage, usage monitoring, and a quantified additionality test type. Extraction confidence is high, so the main limitation is document completeness rather than readability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project, no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage deemed negligible with 0% deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	No safeguards or grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible and no CCP status stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, dated safeguards package covering FPIC, grievance handling, and community benefit-sharing, or clearly document why these are not applicable.

→ Publish a clearer baseline and monitoring trail, including baseline reassessment timing, leakage rationale for the monitored period, and resolution of the crediting-period contradiction.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Report

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-FA25E9E3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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