

QUALITY REPORT

MicroEnergy Credits - Microfinance for Efficient Lighting Product Lines - India

VCS-4196 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-BBA8CD06 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

7.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	7.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	8.3
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	8.7

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

Assessment Summary

This is registry-grade evidence: the official VCS validation/verification report, monitoring report, and project description are publicly available, with a recent joint validation & verification issued on 2024-02-29. The project looks reasonably strong on documentation and transparency, but claim safety is moderated by the energy-efficiency methodology and the need to rely on survey-based usage/baseline assumptions rather than metered household data.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-4196
Country	India
Project Methodology	AMS-II.C 15.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2028
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	48,430 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-08

Red Flags

- Survey-based operating hours and baseline lamp-use estimates introduce residual uncertainty in credited reductions.
- No evidence provided of CCP eligibility, Article 6 authorization, or corresponding adjustment for buyer claims.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 7.4 / 10

+ VVB states project is additional and baseline incandescent-lamp scenario was verified [Validation/Verification Report, 2024-02-29]

~ Conservative choice not to claim inverter-LED ERs improves integrity, but household survey inputs still drive uncertainty [Validation/Verification Report]

Earthood's joint validation & verification report (VCS.VAL.23.71, issued 2024-02-29) states the project is additional under AMS-II.C. and that the baseline scenario of incandescent lamps was verified through site visits and end-user interviews. The report also notes a conservative choice not to claim inverter-LED emission reductions, which supports integrity, and it records 7 CARs and 4 CLs that were resolved. The main residual weakness is that the core ER calculation still depends on sampled household surveys for operating hours and baseline lamp use, which is inherently less robust than metered data.

Transparency — 8.3 / 10

+ Public registry-linked joint validation & verification report includes dates, sample sizes, findings, and methodology version [Validation/Verification Report]

+ Monitoring period and issuance request are disclosed; underlying annexes are referenced but not fully shown in extract [Monitoring/Verification Report]

Publicly accessible registry documents include the joint validation & verification report, monitoring report text extract, and related representations, all tied to VCS project ID 4196. The report provides dates, sample sizes, interview lists, methodology version, and issuance period, which is strong disclosure. Some underlying annexes and protocols are referenced but not fully reproduced in the extract, so transparency is good but not perfect.

Claim Safety — 6.8 / 10

+ Recent monitoring period and verification reduce vintage risk [Monitoring/Verification Report; Validation/Verification Report]

~ Standard VCS issuance is visible, but no Article 6/corresponding-adjustment evidence is provided [Registry/Report extract]

The project is on VCS, but there is no evidence in the provided documents of CCP approval, Article 6 authorization, or corresponding adjustment, so buyer claims should remain limited to standard voluntary offsetting. The vintage/monitoring period is recent (15/07/2021 to 31/03/2023, with verification in late 2023 and issuance request in 2024), which reduces vintage risk. Double-counting risk appears managed through registry issuance, but the report does not provide special claim-labeling beyond standard VCS issuance.

Documentation — 8.7 / 10

+ Validation report, verification report content, monitoring report extract, and representations are available publicly [Registry PDFs]

+ On-site audit, remote re-audit, and appendix references indicate a substantial audit trail [Validation/Verification Report]

Documentation is strong: the validation report, verification report content, monitoring report extract, and representations are all present, and the VVB describes on-site audits plus remote re-audit. The report also references Appendix I document lists, Appendix IV findings, and Appendix V photos, indicating a substantial audit trail. Missing from the extract are the full standalone PDD and full annexes, but the joint PD-MR and verification evidence are sufficient for a high documentation score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	documented evidence
● Permanence	low reversal risk for non-AFOLU efficiency project
● Leakage	limited leakage discussion; not a primary risk but not deepl
● Baseline	baseline verified, but survey-based assumptions remain
● Safeguards	no material safeguard issues identified in evidence
● Double-claim	registry issuance present, but no corresponding-adjustment e

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish the full standalone PDD and annexes, including baseline survey methodology and calculation sheets, on the registry page.
- Disclose annual post-issuance monitoring results for operating hours, lamp survival, and any replacement/breakage rates to reduce survey uncertainty.
- If the buyer wants climate-claim robustness, provide explicit claim guidance on whether any Article 6 authorization or corresponding adjustment exists.

Documents Reviewed

- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation

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-BBA8CD06 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-08 · Generated: 2026-04-08
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy