


QUALITY REPORT

# 140 MW Solar Photovoltaic Project in Rajasthan

VCS-1709 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-0845EC27 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

## Assessment Summary

This is a registered solar project with VVB-verified additionality and a clear project baseline, but the documentation shows several gaps and inconsistencies. The monitoring report also contains multiple corrective actions and unresolved details on stakeholder communication, meter calibration, and ER sheet consistency, which reduce confidence in the claimed reductions.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1709
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0002 17.03
Crediting Period	2017 — 2027
VVB	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	374,630 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2025
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	38 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

## Red Flags

- The monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including inconsistent ER calculations, missing calibration certificates, and missing metering line diagrams.
- Claimed and verified emission reduction figures differ across documents, and the record contains contradictions on safeguards and grievance documentation.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring record.
- Leakage is not addressed, with a zero deduction but no supporting justification, and reversal risk is not clearly handled because buffer pool coverage is not stated.

The project's additionality is stronger than average because the monitoring record says the investment test was used and the VVB confirmed it. However, the baseline is project-based, leakage is shown as a 0% deduction without justification, and buffer pool coverage is not stated, so permanence and leakage robustness are only moderate. The monitoring report also lists multiple corrective actions, including inconsistent ER calculations and missing calibration certificates, which weakens confidence in the emissions accounting.

### Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a substantial set of extracted source documents.
- The monitoring report includes several corrective actions and missing details, including inconsistent ER data, missing calibration certificates, and incomplete stakeholder communication records.

Transparency is mixed: the project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and a large document set, which helps traceability. But the monitoring report includes several unresolved issues, such as missing stakeholder communication details, missing metering line diagrams, and inconsistent reporting of vintage-wise reductions. The record also shows contradictions between documents on safeguards and grievance-related disclosures, which lowers trust in the completeness of the public record.

### Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and leakage treatment is weakly justified.

Claim safety is constrained by the project-specific baseline and weak leakage treatment. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-claim exposure, but CCP status is not stated. Claimed and verified emission reduction figures differ across documents, and the contradictions in reported totals suggest some over-crediting or reporting reliability risk.

### Documentation — 5.6 / 10

- + The extraction confidence is high and the record includes both validation and monitoring materials.
- The monitoring report is dated later than the crediting start, but key items remain unresolved, and several contradictions indicate reliability issues in the document set.

Documentation quality is moderate rather than strong. The extraction confidence is high and the record includes multiple official documents, but the monitoring report still contains many corrective actions and missing details. The contradictions on grievance mechanisms, FPIC, safeguards, and emission reduction totals indicate that the document set is not fully internally consistent, even though the core evidence is present.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer pool stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Zero deduction without justification
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline only
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards partly documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unstated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear leakage assessment and justify the zero leakage deduction with project-specific evidence.

→ Submit complete calibration certificates, metering diagrams, and a reconciled ER table that resolves the reported inconsistencies and contradictions.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- Sustainable Development Contributions Report
- Draft Project Description
- 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-0845EC27 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy