

QUALITY REPORT

*PRE_CDM VER Tonk Biomass Project, India

GS-1095 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-B8D5A64F · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

This biomass project has some positive integrity signals, including a VVB-confirmed additionality assessment and quantified leakage treatment, but the record also shows multiple verification findings and unresolved reversal handling. Transparency is limited by missing verified issuance figures and incomplete monitoring details, while the documentation is only moderate because three documents were used and extraction confidence was not high.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1095
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D Version 11
Crediting Period	2008-10-07 — null
VVB	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Monitoring Period	2007 — 2008
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- The verification report lists multiple findings and required corrective actions, including several CAR/CR/FAR items.
- Crediting period and leakage treatment differ across documents, creating reliability concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH using a combined test.
- The verification report records multiple findings and corrective actions, and reversal events are not addressed.

The verification report by TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH confirms additionality through a combined test, which supports the project's core crediting logic. However, the same report lists multiple findings and corrective actions, and reversal events are not addressed, so permanence and implementation robustness are weaker than ideal. The project also uses a project-specific baseline, and no buffer pool percentage is stated in the extracted record.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period in the verification record.
- Verified and claimed emission reduction totals are not stated, and the usage monitoring method is not found in the extracted record.

The documentation identifies the verifier and gives a clear monitoring period from 2007-10-07 to 2008-10-06, which helps traceability. But the extracted record does not state verified or claimed emission reduction totals, and the usage monitoring method is not found. With only medium extraction confidence, the public-data and MRV picture remains incomplete.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

- + Leakage is treated with a quantified deduction of 0%, which is better than an unaddressed leakage claim.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed baseline, and the leakage justification conflicts across documents.

Claim safety is helped by the presence of a quantified leakage treatment, including a 0% deduction, but the justification is inconsistent across documents. The contradiction record shows the verification report describing leakage as quantified while the monitoring report describes it as deemed negligible, so I privileged the verification report because it is the higher-priority assurance document. The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, which leaves more room for over-crediting risk than a jurisdictional or recently reassessed baseline would.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + Three official documents were used, including a verification report, PDD, and monitoring report.
- Several key fields are missing or only partially specified, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than high.

The record draws on three official documents, which is a reasonable documentary base, and the project has a named verifier. Still, several important items are missing, including verified emission totals, buffer pool coverage, and usage monitoring details, and the extraction confidence is only medium. The verification report also requires multiple follow-up actions, which suggests the documentation package was not fully clean at the time of review.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	0% deduction with document conflict
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance, and safeguards mentioned
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete monitoring and verification package with verified emission totals, clear usage monitoring, and a reconciled leakage explanation.

→ Document permanence and registry-risk controls more explicitly, including reversal treatment, buffer coverage if applicable, and a clean resolution of all verification findings.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_07-10-07 to 06-10-08_v1.7.pdf
- PDD_02-10-08.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1095
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1095
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_07-10-07 to 06-10-08_v2.1.pdf

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-B8D5A64F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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