

QUALITY REPORT

216 MWac Kamuthi Solar Power Project

VCS-1768 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-F0CFB5D4 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
■ Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a large renewable project with VVB-verified additionality and no material findings reported, which supports moderate integrity. However, leakage is not clearly addressed in the monitoring record, permanence is only indirectly relevant for an avoidance project, and the file contains several documentation gaps and a few contradictions that reduce confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1768
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 18.11
Crediting Period	2016 — 2026
VVB	4K EARTH SCIENCE PRIVATE LIMITED
Verified ERs	519,157 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, while the validation report reportedly treated it as negligible.
- The monitoring report includes multiple corrective actions, including unclear monitoring-period dates, missing meter details, and requests for additional invoices and calibration records.
- The project is not CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated, leaving some claim-safety uncertainty.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the verification record.

- Leakage justification is not addressed in the monitoring report, and the corrective actions show unresolved monitoring and metering issues.

The project has a reasonably strong integrity profile because additionality was tested through an investment test and the VVB confirmed it in the verification record. The monitoring report reports no material findings, but leakage is not addressed there and the corrective actions request more evidence on metering, invoices, and the effect of higher generation on additionality. As this is an avoidance project, reversal risk is limited, but permanence is still not explicitly discussed through a buffer or reversal framework.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period, VVB name, and claimed versus verified emission reductions are all stated in the monitoring report.

- Several key operational details are missing or unclear, including usage monitoring method, leakage deduction, and the exact monitoring-period date boundaries.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring report identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, and identical claimed and verified reductions of 519,157 tCO₂e. At the same time, usage monitoring is not stated, leakage deduction is missing, and the report itself says the monitoring period is unclear about inclusion of the first and last dates. The registry status is only verification approval requested, so public-facing completeness appears incomplete.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is an avoidance project under ACM0002 with claimed and verified reductions matching at 519,157 tCO₂e.

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, with the monitoring report saying it is not addressed while the validation report reportedly deemed it negligible.

Claim safety is middling: the project uses ACM0002 and the claimed and verified issuance figures match, which reduces immediate over-crediting concern. However, the monitoring report does not address leakage, while the validation report reportedly considered it negligible, creating a reliability gap. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-market claim risk, but CCP status is not stated.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

+ The record includes multiple official documents, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material.

- The monitoring report lists several corrective actions and the extraction confidence is not impaired, but the documentation still has missing meter and calibration details.

The file set is fairly broad, with the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material all present, and extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report contains several corrective actions, including missing meter details, calibration records, and coordinate mismatches, which show documentation weaknesses. The crediting period is long and the monitoring period is later, but the record still lacks some operational specifics needed for a cleaner audit trail.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project, no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed in monitoring record
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline, reassessment timing not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, reconciled leakage assessment and explain why the monitoring report differs from the validation report.

→ Publish complete monitoring evidence, including meter inventories, calibration records, and unambiguous monitoring-period boundaries.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- 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-F0CFB5D4 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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