QUALITY REPORT

16.45 MW bundled grid connected renewable energy project in Tamil Nadu, India.

VCS-678 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-548411EC · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.6
Transparency (25%)	4.8
Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS renewable energy project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings, which supports a moderate integrity profile. However, the record shows major documentation gaps, leakage is not addressed, and there are serious contradictions in the reported emission reductions that reduce confidence in the claimed volume.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-678
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 10
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A.(Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	19,361 tCO_2e
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	23 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed, with no quantified deduction or justification found in the monitoring record.
- The extracted record contains a large contradiction in emission reductions: 193,618 tonnes in earlier documents versus 19,361 tonnes in later documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

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

- Leakage is marked as not addressed, and no buffer pool or reversal information is available in the extracted documents.

The verification record confirms additionality through an investment test, and the VVB accepted the project without material findings. That said, leakage is explicitly not addressed, and there is no buffer pool or reversal evidence in the extracted record, which weakens permanence and environmental robustness for a renewable energy project. The baseline is project-specific, and the available facts do not show a recent reassessment.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and the claimed and verified ER totals are both present in the extracted record.

- The monitoring report notes missing supporting documents, blank ER sheet fields, and absent calibration certificates, which weakens MRV transparency.

The project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and both claimed and verified emission reductions are present in the extracted data. However, the monitoring report says the project participant did not provide technical equipment details, commissioning certificates, PPAs, O&M; agreements, JMRs, invoices, complete ER sheets, or calibration certificates, which is a substantial transparency gap. The medium extraction confidence also suggests at least one key document was not fully readable.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of dual-claim risk.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and the emission reduction figures show a major contradiction across documents.

Claim safety is weakened by the large contradiction in emission reductions: earlier documents show 193,618 tonnes, while later documents show 19,361 tonnes. I privileged the later monitoring and validation figures because they are more recent and appear to reflect the final verified amount, but the discrepancy still signals reliability risk. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but the project-specific baseline and missing leakage treatment leave over-crediting risk unresolved.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

+ The record includes multiple official document types, including a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material.

- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the monitoring report lists several corrective actions tied to missing source documents and incomplete records.

Documentation is mixed: there are multiple official documents in the record, including validation and monitoring materials, and the project has a named VVB. But the monitoring report lists numerous corrective actions and missing supporting evidence, and the extraction confidence is only medium. The crediting period is also much older than the monitoring period, which suggests the documentation set is not fully current or complete.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
Leakage	Leakage not addressed
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; no CCP status

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide complete source documentation for equipment, commissioning, PPAs, O&M; agreements, JMRs, invoices, and calibration certificates to close the MRV gaps.

→ Resolve the emission reduction discrepancy and document a clear leakage assessment, including any quantified deduction or justification.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-548411EC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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