

QUALITY REPORT

Biomass based cogeneration plant at Godrej Agrovet Ltd. Chintampalli

VCS-1315 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-229ABEF9 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.2Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.6
■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.9
■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive evidence on additionality and verification, but the record also shows major documentation gaps and several unresolved quality issues. The monitoring report and validation materials contain many corrective actions, and there is a contradiction on credited emissions and crediting-period framing that reduces confidence in the figures.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1315
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.C 19
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	86,509 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The monitoring report lists many missing documents and calculation issues, including missing meter calibration details, missing monitoring logs, and incorrect biomass and coal consumption calculations.
- The project was also claiming CDM, and the record says evidence against double counting was not provided.
- Verified and claimed emission reductions are 86,509 in the later validation record, but an earlier validation record shows 121,083, creating a material inconsistency.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.6 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and the VVB confirmed it in the validation report by Earthood Services Private Limited.

- Leakage is only described as deemed negligible in the monitoring report, while the earlier report had a quantified approach and the later record does not provide a quantified deduction.

The project has a positive additionality signal because the validation report says an investment test was used and the VVB confirmed it. However, permanence is weakly documented for a biomass cogeneration project because reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is found in the extracted record. Leakage is also only described as deemed negligible in the monitoring report, without a quantified deduction, which weakens robustness.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The project has named verification by Earthood Services Private Limited and the monitoring report provides a defined monitoring period.

- The monitoring report lists numerous missing supporting records, and the emission reduction spreadsheet and several monitoring logs were not submitted.

Transparency is limited by the number of missing monitoring inputs and calculation support items listed in the monitoring report, including meter calibration details, monitoring logs, and the emission reduction spreadsheet. The project does have a named VVB and a defined monitoring period, but the record still shows substantial gaps in public-facing MRV completeness. The monitoring report also notes missing feeder-wise location and breakdown details for the plant.

Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

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

- The record shows a large discrepancy between earlier and later validated emission reduction figures, and the project was also claiming CDM without evidence that double counting was prevented.

Claim safety is reduced by the contradiction in verified and claimed emission reductions: the later validation record shows 86,509, while an earlier validation record shows 121,083. I privileged the later validation value because it is more recent, but the discrepancy itself indicates reliability risk. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but the record also says the project was claiming CDM and no evidence was provided to show there would be no double counting.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

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

- The monitoring report contains many corrective actions and missing items, and the extraction record notes an unknown document plus a poorly complete evidence trail.

Documentation quality is mixed: there are multiple official sources available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report lists many corrective actions and missing documents, including commissioning certificates, NCV proof, tariff order, and manufacturer specifications. The crediting-period contradiction is also important: I privileged the later monitoring record because it is more recent, but the inconsistency lowers confidence in the documentation set.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● Permanence	No reversal treatment found
● Leakage	Negligible claim without quantified deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	Grievance mechanism present, FPIC not conducted
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions statement explaining the 86,509 versus 121,083 discrepancy and attach the underlying calculation sheets.

→ Submit the missing monitoring evidence, including meter calibration records, log sheets, commissioning certificates, and a clear double-counting safeguard statement.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-229ABEF9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy