QUALITY REPORT

6.5 MW Cogeneration Project In Akbarpur, Punjab

VCS-1160 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-57E9F1BC · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	4.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some strengths: the VVB confirmed an investment-test additionality case, and the monitoring report shows no material findings. However, the record has meaningful reliability and MRV gaps, including missing leakage quantification, missing baseline reassessment timing, and extensive corrective actions requested by the verifier. The ERR figures are internally inconsistent across documents, so the crediting claim should be treated cautiously.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1160
Sector	industrial
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.C. 18
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	53,803 tCO_2e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- ■ The verified and claimed emission reductions are contradicted by an earlier validation figure, creating a reliability concern.
- ■ Leakage is described as negligible, but no deduction percentage is stated and the validation record says leakage was not addressed.
- ■ The monitoring report lists many missing supporting documents, calibration details, and double-counting declarations.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the validation/verification record.

- Leakage treatment is weak: the monitoring report says it is deemed negligible, but no quantified deduction is stated and the validation record noted it was not addressed.

The project's additionality case is moderately credible because the VVB confirmed an investment test, and the monitoring report reports no material findings. That said, permanence is not a major issue for an avoidance project, but leakage handling is weak because the report only says it is deemed negligible and does not state a deduction percentage. The baseline is project-specific, and the record does not show when it was last reassessed, which limits confidence in the emissions estimate.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The project has both validation and monitoring documentation, and the monitoring report reports no material findings.

- The monitoring report contains numerous corrective actions, including missing commissioning evidence, calibration details, log sheets, and double-counting declarations.

Transparency is mixed. The project has a VVB name, a defined monitoring period, and a monitoring report with no material findings, but the same report lists many corrective actions and missing supporting documents, including commissioning evidence, calibration details, logbooks, and double-counting declarations. The monitoring approach for usage is not stated, and the record does not provide a clear public trail for several key MRV inputs.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of dual-claim risk.

- The emission reduction totals are contradicted across documents, with 53,803 tCO2e in the monitoring record versus 193,456 tCO2e in the earlier validation record.

Claim safety is weakened by the discrepancy in emission reduction figures: the monitoring record shows 53,803 tCO2e verified and claimed, while the earlier validation record shows 193,456 tCO2e. I privileged the later monitoring report for the current claim because it is more recent and directly tied to the issuance period, but the contradiction still lowers confidence. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but the lack of quantified leakage treatment and the project-specific baseline keep over-crediting risk above average.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records.

- The monitoring report shows many missing or inconsistent items, and several key fields such as buffer pool treatment and baseline reassessment timing are not stated.

Documentation quality is moderate rather than strong. There are multiple official documents available and extraction confidence is high, but the monitoring report itself contains a long list of requested corrections and missing evidence, which suggests incomplete recordkeeping. The crediting period is much longer than the monitoring period, and several important items such as buffer pool treatment and baseline reassessment timing are not found in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project, buffer not stated
● **Leakage**	Negligible claim without quantified deduction
● **Baseline**	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
● **Safeguards**	Grievance mechanism present, FPIC absent
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a fully reconciled emissions accounting package that explains the 53,803 versus 193,456 tCO2e discrepancy and ties the final claim to one authoritative calculation set.

→ Submit complete MRV evidence, including calibration records, commissioning documents, logbooks, leakage treatment, and explicit double-counting declarations.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-57E9F1BC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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