QUALITY REPORT

Bundled Rooftop Solar Power Project by SPPL 01

VCS-4071 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-F3D063A5 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	4.4
	Transparency (25%)	4.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered rooftop solar project with VVB validation, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism, which supports a moderate-quality profile. However, key documentation gaps remain around monitoring, usage, and crediting details, and the record contains contradictions on leakage treatment and the crediting period that reduce confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-4071
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS-I.F 05.0
Crediting Period	2023 — 2030
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- ■ The validation report says leakage was not addressed, while the PDD described it as negligible.
- ■ The crediting period differs between the validation report and the PDD, creating a reliability concern.
- ■ No monitoring period, verified emission reductions, or usage monitoring method were found in the extracted record.
- ■ Extraction confidence is low, so at least one key source was poorly readable.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the validation report from 2024-11-15.

- Leakage treatment is weak because the validation report says it was not addressed, despite the PDD calling it negligible.

The validation report confirms additionality was checked by the VVB, which is a positive sign for project integrity. The project also has no reported material findings or corrective actions in the validation report. However, leakage is a concern because the validation report says it was not addressed, while the PDD described it as negligible, so I treated the more recent validation report as higher priority.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, 4K Earth Science Private Limited, and a recent validation report dated 2024-11-15.

- Monitoring-period details, verified and claimed emission reductions, and the usage monitoring method were not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited by missing monitoring information: the extracted record does not include a monitoring period, verified emission reductions, claimed emission reductions, or a usage monitoring method. The presence of a named VVB and a dated validation report helps, but the documentation is not complete enough to support strong public MRV confidence. The low extraction confidence further weakens transparency because one or more source documents were difficult to read.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project uses a rooftop solar methodology under VCS, which is generally lower-risk than many land-use credit types.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and leakage justification is inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is moderate rather than strong. Rooftop solar under VCS is generally less exposed to reversal risk than land-based projects, but the project still relies on a project-specific baseline and the leakage treatment is inconsistent between documents. I did not find evidence of double registration or dual issuance, but CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not stated in the extracted record, so channel-risk cannot be ruled out.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ Multiple official document types were used, including a PDD and validation report, and no material findings or corrective actions were reported.

- Extraction confidence is low, and the record lacks several core fields such as monitoring period and verified emission data.

The documentation set includes at least a PDD and a validation report, and the validation report is recent relative to the crediting period. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, which is positive. Still, the record is incomplete on several core items, and the low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, so documentation quality is only fair.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete monitoring report with the monitoring period, verified emission reductions, and the usage monitoring method.

→ Resolve the leakage and crediting-period inconsistencies by issuing a reconciled document trail that explains which values are authoritative and why.

Documents Reviewed

- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- Listing Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-F3D063A5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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