

QUALITY REPORT

# Bundled Solar Power Project by Mahindra Susten Private Limited

VCS-1767 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-CF50F59E · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

## Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS solar project with VVB-verified investment-test additionality and documented safeguards, but the evidence base shows material issues in emissions accounting and unresolved leakage treatment. The project’s claimed reductions were materially revised downward in verification, and the monitoring report still flags calculation inconsistencies and missing supporting evidence for several items.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1767
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 18.1
Crediting Period	2016 — 2026
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	215,993 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	31 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

## Red Flags

- The verification record shows a large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions, with 611,586 claimed versus 215,993 verified.
- The monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, and it also records calculation inconsistencies and missing supporting documents.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and confirmed by the VVB in the verification report.
- The monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, and the verification file includes several corrective actions for calculation and documentation issues.

The project's additionality case is stronger than average because the verification report confirms an investment test and the VVB accepted it. However, integrity is weakened by the monitoring report's statement that leakage was not addressed, plus multiple corrective actions tied to emission calculation compliance and missing calibration evidence. The project is an avoidance-style solar activity, so permanence risk is inherently low, but the record still shows quality-control weaknesses in the monitored data.

### Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a detailed monitoring report dated 2022-08-22.
- The monitoring report shows a large difference between claimed and verified reductions, and several supporting items were missing or inconsistent.

Transparency is mixed: the project has a named VVB, a clear monitoring period, and a substantial document set. That said, the monitoring report records a large gap between claimed and verified reductions, and several supporting details were missing or inconsistent, including stakeholder consultation evidence and meter calibration documentation. The absence of a clear usage-monitoring method also limits traceability of how the reductions were derived.

### Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

- + The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of dual-claim risk.
- The verified emissions reductions are far below the claimed amount, and leakage treatment is not addressed in the monitoring report.

Claim safety is weakened by the large discrepancy between claimed and verified reductions, with 611,586 claimed versus 215,993 verified in the verification record. The monitoring report also says leakage was not addressed, which increases over-crediting risk even though the project is not CORSIA-eligible. The baseline is project-based rather than jurisdictional, so the claim depends heavily on the quality of the project accounting.

### Documentation — 6.1 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence.
- The monitoring report lists numerous corrective actions, including missing calibration evidence, incomplete stakeholder details, and an inconsistency in exported electricity readings.

Documentation breadth is reasonably good because the extracted record includes validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report contains many corrective actions, including missing calibration certificates, incomplete local stakeholder details, and an inconsistency in exported electricity readings. The crediting period is long and the monitoring period is relatively recent, but the quality issues prevent a higher documentation score.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Solar avoidance project
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible and no CCP approval stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and reconcile it with the earlier validation statement that leakage was quantified.

→ Resolve the monitoring and verification inconsistencies by submitting complete calibration certificates, corrected electricity export data, and a documented double-counting declaration.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification 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-CF50F59E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy