QUALITY REPORT

Solar Grouped Project By Acme Group (Ekiesl-VCS-Aug-16-01)

VCS-1580 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-6A656FAC · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10		
	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS grid-connected solar grouped project using ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB, but several MRV and reporting weaknesses reduce confidence. Leakage treatment is not evidenced in the extracted record, and multiple document contradictions (including ER figures and safeguards/grievance claims) raise reliability and over-crediting concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1580
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2016, 2017
Project Methodology	ACM0002 17.01
Crediting Period	2015 — 2025
VVB	LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	472,857 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	41 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Conflicting emissions reduction figures across documents (claimed and verified), including a case where verified exceeds claimed, increasing over-crediting and data reliability risk.
- Monitoring/verification raised numerous corrective actions and missing evidence items (e.g., commissioning/PPA/O&M; documents, complete JMRs/invoices, calibration certificates), indicating MRV control weaknesses.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (monitoring report, 2023-08-17).

- Leakage was not addressed and no leakage deduction is evidenced in the extracted record, despite ACM0002 requiring explicit leakage consideration (monitoring report, 2023-08-17).

Additionality is relatively strong on paper: the monitoring report indicates an investment-test additionality argument and that it was confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2023-08-17). However, the baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not found in the extracted record, which weakens robustness for a long crediting period (2015-06-22 to 2025-06-21). Leakage is explicitly not addressed in the extracted record and no leakage deduction is evidenced, which is a material integrity gap for ACM0002-style accounting (monitoring report, 2023-08-17).

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ Key project attributes are disclosed (VVB: LGAI/Applus+, methodology ACM0002 v17.01, monitoring period 2022-05-01 to 2023-01-31) (monitoring report, 2023-08-17).

- Extensive CARs and missing monitoring evidence (e.g., meter calibration certificates, complete JMRs/invoices, missing supporting contracts/certificates) reduce MRV transparency (monitoring report, 2023-08-17).

Core MRV descriptors are present (methodology ACM0002 v17.01, grid emission factor 0.9777, monitoring period 2022-05-01 to 2023-01-31, VVB identified as LGAI/Applus+) (monitoring report, 2023-08-17). Transparency is reduced by the volume of corrective actions and requests for missing evidence (e.g., complete JMRs/invoices, calibration certificates, commissioning/PPA/O&M; documents, breakdown/location details), which suggests the monitoring package was not audit-ready initially (monitoring report, 2023-08-17). In addition, contradictions in key fields (ER totals, safeguards/grievance) reduce confidence that public-facing statements are consistent across the record.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (monitoring report, 2023-08-17).

- ER numbers are inconsistent across documents and include a higher verified value than another stated verified/claimed value, elevating over-crediting/greenwashing risk (validation reports 2022-10-10; 2023-09-12; monitoring reports 2021-04-23; 2022-09-28).

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of problematic aviation-aligned claims (monitoring report, 2023-08-17). Claim safety is nonetheless weakened by inconsistent ER figures across documents and by the presence of a corrective action explicitly stating ER values were corrected, which increases perceived over-crediting risk (monitoring report, 2023-08-17). CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on an additional quality screen here.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was available (29 documents including PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- The monitoring report lists many missing or corrected documents and repeated CARs, indicating incomplete/weak documentation at assessment time (monitoring report, 2023-08-17).

The extracted record references multiple document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and uses 29 documents with high extraction confidence, which is a positive foundation. However, the monitoring report lists numerous CARs and repeated missing-document issues (e.g., calibration certificates, complete JMRs/invoices, commissioning/PPA/O&M; agreements, stakeholder documentation), indicating documentation completeness problems at the time of assessment (monitoring report, 2023-08-17). These gaps and revisions reduce confidence in the underlying evidence trail even if later provided.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversal events evidenced
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed / deduction not evidenced
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC inconsistent across documents
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled ER table (by vintage and monitoring period) that explains all corrections and aligns claimed vs verified totals across monitoring/validation/issuance documents.

→ Provide complete MRV evidence packages upfront (meter calibration certificates for the full period, complete JMRs/invoices, commissioning/PPA/O&M; documents) and a consistent safeguards/FPIC and grievance narrative with supporting records.

Documents Reviewed

• Issuance Representation
• Issuance Review Report
• Monitoring Report
• Communications Agreement
• Registration Representation
• Registration Review Report
• Project Description
• Verification Report
• Verification Representation
• Validation Representation
• Validation 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-6A656FAC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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