

QUALITY REPORT

IND/REC/SLR/VER/18072025/00007

OG-687a2aae · VCS · India Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-BAC0DDA1 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.8
	■ 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 documentation, so key integrity and MRV elements (baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring results) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high due to lack of evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-687a2aae
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring.
- 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 — 2.2 / 10

- Baseline approach, additionality assessment, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions are not found in the extracted record because no documents were available.

~ Project is labeled as renewable energy avoidance, which typically has low permanence risk, but permanence provisions (e.g., buffer/reversal handling) are not evidenced in the extracted record.

No baseline method, additionality test, leakage approach, or monitoring/verification outcomes are available because the extracted record contains no evidence documents. As a result, additionality robustness and baseline validity cannot be substantiated from the extracted record. While renewable energy avoidance projects generally have low reversal risk, permanence provisions (buffer pool, reversal events) are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 0.8 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed emission reductions are available in the extracted record.

- Registry/public reporting completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record provides no VVB identity, monitoring period, or claimed-versus-verified emission reductions. With no documents captured, MRV quality and registry completeness cannot be checked against primary sources. Low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that key transparency information is missing or unreadable.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline method, grid factors/FNRB approach, and usage/monitoring methods are not found in the extracted record.

~ CORSIA/CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so double-claim/eligibility-related claim risk remains uncertain.

Claim safety is low because the extracted record does not include the baseline method, grid emissions factor/FNRB approach, or any evidence of how generation/usage was monitored, all of which are central to avoiding over-crediting in renewable energy projects. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, leaving eligibility-related claim risk unresolved. The absence of any quantified verified results also prevents checking for inconsistencies in crediting claims.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents used and an empty evidence list indicate severe documentation gaps in the extracted record.

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability of any missing/absent information.

Documentation is severely insufficient: the extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence list. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability for at least one key source and reducing confidence that missing items are truly absent. Without core documents (PDD, monitoring report, verification report), the project cannot be assessed reliably.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found in extracted record
● Permanence	Avoidance type but no permanence provisions evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found in extracted record
● Baseline	No baseline method found in extracted record
● Safeguards	No safeguards/FPIC/grievance evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not found in extracted record

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and link the core VCS documents (PDD, monitoring report(s), verification report(s), and VVB statements) so baseline, additionality, leakage, and verified ERs can be checked.

→ Improve document readability/extraction quality (higher-resolution scans or native PDFs) and include registry fields (VVB name, monitoring period, claimed vs verified ERs, CORSIA/CCP status) to enable a complete MRV and claim-risk assessment.

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-BAC0DDA1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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