

QUALITY REPORT

Bundled Waste Processing Facilities in India

CNN-355220 · ACR · India

Report ID: CM-D65EA25B · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project details beyond the project name, standard, and registry code, and the minimum extraction confidence is low. With no accessible evidence on baseline, additionality, monitoring, leakage, or verification outcomes, the project cannot be assessed as high quality based on the available documents.

Project Details

Registry	American Carbon Registry (ACR)
Registry ID	CNN-355220
Sector	industrial
Country	India
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, MRV, and safeguards
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or misread critical information

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality approach, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any corrective actions were not found in the extracted record

~ The project is described as an avoidance project, but permanence/reversal risk management (e.g., buffer pool or reversal procedures) is not stated in available documents

No project design or assurance content was available in the extracted record: no baseline approach, additionality test, leakage assessment, or permanence/reversal provisions were found. With zero documents used and low extraction confidence, there is insufficient evidence to judge whether the credited reductions are additional or conservatively quantified. Integrity is therefore scored very low due to the evidence gap.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verification/monitoring results were found in the extracted record

- No public-facing MRV details (e.g., claimed vs verified reductions, monitoring methods) were available from the extracted documents

The extracted record does not include a verification body, monitoring period, monitoring methodology, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions. With no documents available, registry-level completeness and MRV transparency cannot be substantiated. Transparency is scored very low because the underlying data needed for third-party scrutiny is missing.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- No information was found on baseline stringency, leakage justification, or any quantified deductions, increasing over-crediting risk

~ Eligibility/labels that affect claims (e.g., CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not stated in available documents

No information was found on baseline stringency, leakage deductions or justification, or any parameters that would indicate over-crediting risk controls. The extracted record also does not state whether the project is CORSIA-eligible or has any CCP-related status, leaving claim-related labeling risks unresolved. Claim safety is therefore low given the inability to validate conservative accounting and eligibility claims.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided in the extracted record (0 documents used)

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing confidence in completeness and accuracy of extraction

The extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates low minimum extraction confidence, implying key documents were not available or not readable. This prevents assessment of recency, completeness, and whether any corrective actions were required and closed. Documentation is scored near the floor due to the absence of usable source material.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Reversal risk management not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the PDD, validation/verification reports, and monitoring reports so baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV procedures and results can be checked
- Disclose key assurance and registry fields (VVB name, monitoring period, claimed vs verified reductions, corrective actions, and CORSIA/CCP status) and ensure documents are readable to raise extraction confidence

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-D65EA25B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy