

QUALITY REPORT

IND/CIC/undefined/VER/18072025/00008

OG-687a3849 · VCS · India Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-9094B14D · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so key quality determinants (additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV performance) cannot be assessed. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak substantiation is high based on evidence gaps alone.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-687a3849
Sector	other
Country	India Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing assessment of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring quality
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any non-conformities were not found in the extracted record due to missing documents

~ With no evidence, integrity cannot be substantiated and is scored conservatively

No verification report, monitoring report, or PDD content was found in the extracted record (0 documents), so additionality testing, baseline method selection, leakage treatment, and any corrective actions cannot be evaluated. Given the absence of evidence and low extraction confidence, the score is set very low to reflect unsubstantiated climate benefit claims.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or verification/issuance details were found in the extracted record

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be evaluated because no underlying documents were captured

The extracted record does not include the VVB name, monitoring period, or any quantified claimed versus verified emission reductions because no documents were captured. With low extraction confidence and no evidence base, MRV transparency and registry completeness cannot be substantiated and are scored conservatively.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim safeguards were not found in the extracted record

~ Over-crediting risk cannot be bounded because baseline and leakage assumptions are unknown

No information was found in the extracted record on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, baseline parameters, or leakage justification, all of which are central to assessing over-crediting and greenwashing risk. In the absence of these facts, claim safety is scored low because buyers cannot verify whether credits are defensible.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, indicating a major documentation gap

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/availability issues

The extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates low extraction confidence, implying either missing files or unreadable sources. This is a critical documentation failure that undermines confidence in all other dimensions and triggers the documentation-related gate rule (documentation below 3 would cap transparency post-scoring).

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	No baseline method found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, latest monitoring report, and latest verification report so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV results can be assessed

→ Provide registry/issuance documentation including VVB details, monitoring period dates, and claimed vs verified emission reductions, plus any CORSIA/CCP status statements

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-9094B14D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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