

QUALITY REPORT

IND/REC/SLR/VER/03012026/00022

OG-6958c603 · VCS · India Total Credits

Report ID: CM-6C36CC92 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.2
	■ 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 documentation, so core quality elements (baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV results) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high by default.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-6958c603
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India Total Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, leakage, or monitoring results
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, 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 were not found in the extracted record (no documents available)

~ Project is labeled renewable energy avoidance, but without documents the baseline and grid emission factor assumptions cannot be checked

No validation/verification, monitoring, or PDD content was available in the extracted record (0 documents), so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and any material findings/corrective actions cannot be confirmed. Although the project is described as renewable energy avoidance, the absence of baseline and grid factor documentation prevents assessing whether credited reductions are conservative. Given these evidence gaps, integrity is scored very low.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed emission reductions were found in the extracted record

- Registry/documentation completeness is effectively absent because no evidence documents were provided

The extracted record provides no public-facing MRV details: no VVB name, no monitoring period, and no claimed-versus-verified emission reduction figures. With no evidence documents listed, there is no way to cross-check registry completeness or the quality of monitoring and verification. Transparency is therefore very weak.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, leakage justification, and any usage/operational monitoring evidence were not found

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, so double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be evaluated

Without baseline method, leakage justification, or any verified monitoring outputs in the extracted record, the risk of overstated credits cannot be ruled out and must be treated as elevated. Eligibility signals that often reduce greenwashing risk (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, so double-claim/market-eligibility risk cannot be screened. Claim safety is scored low due to the inability to substantiate key assertions.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used and no evidence documents were listed in the extracted record

- Extraction confidence is low, reducing reliability even if some information exists outside the extracted record

No evidence documents were captured (0 documents used), and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable. This combination suggests both severe incompleteness and reliability concerns in the extracted record. Documentation is scored near the floor.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and extract the core VCS documents (PDD, validation report, latest monitoring report, and verification report) so baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV results can be assessed

→ Improve document readability/extraction quality (higher-confidence OCR) and include registry fields (VVB name, monitoring period, claimed vs verified ERs, CORSIA/CCP status) to enable cross-checks and reduce claim risk

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-6C36CC92 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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