

QUALITY REPORT

AAC Block/Panel Manufacturing unit at Krishna, Andhra Pradesh

VCS-1342 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-D32F64A6 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS manufacturing project with VVB-confirmed additionality, but the evidence base has notable gaps around leakage, permanence, and monitoring detail. The project's claimed and verified issuance totals are consistent in the latest record, yet earlier validation documents show a much lower figure, which raises reliability concerns that temper confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1342
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS III.Z. 5.0
Crediting Period	2013 — 2023
VVB	KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	129,382 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The monitoring report lists corrective actions for mismatched electricity consumption, missing DG set details, and a biomass sourcing distance check, suggesting unresolved MRV weaknesses.
- Earlier validation documents reported a much lower verified and claimed amount than the later record, creating a material contradiction in issuance figures.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using a barrier approach and the VVB confirmed it in the verification/validation record.
- Leakage treatment is not quantified in the extracted record, and no buffer pool or reversal protection is stated.

The project has a positive signal on additionality because the validation/verification record says a barrier test was used and the VVB confirmed it. However, the extracted record does not state a buffer pool, reversal events, or a leakage deduction percentage, so permanence and leakage controls are only partially evidenced. The monitoring report also lists corrective actions for electricity invoice mismatches, missing DG set details, and biomass sourcing distance, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the emissions reduction calculation.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

- + The latest monitoring report and VVB name are identified, and the monitoring period is clearly stated as 2016-01-01 to 2021-05-31.
- Key MRV fields such as usage monitoring method, usage rate verification, and baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents.

Transparency is moderate because the project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a clear registry context under VCS. At the same time, the usage monitoring method is not stated, the usage rate is not verified, and the baseline reassessment date is not found in available documents. The monitoring report provides some MRV detail, but the absence of several core parameters limits public traceability.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

- + The latest record shows claimed and verified ER totals matching at 129,382, which reduces immediate over-issuance concern for that period.
- The project is not CORSIA-eligible, but leakage is only described as quantified without a deduction value, and earlier issuance figures conflict sharply with the later record.

Claim safety is mixed. The latest validation record shows claimed and verified ER totals both at 129,382, which is reassuring for internal consistency in that record. But the project is not CORSIA-eligible, leakage is only described as quantified without the actual deduction value, and the earlier validation documents report 56,233 for both claimed and verified totals, creating a major discrepancy that increases over-crediting and reliability risk.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Multiple document types were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and extraction confidence is high.
- The monitoring report still required corrective actions, and several important fields remain unstated, including buffer pool coverage and reversal history.

Documentation quality is fair because multiple official document types were available and extraction confidence is high. Still, several important fields are missing from the extracted record, including buffer pool coverage, reversal history, and monitoring methodology details. The monitoring report's corrective actions also indicate that the documentation package was not fully clean at the time of review.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● Leakage	Leakage mentioned but deduction not shown
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	Grievance present, FPIC inconsistent
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the full leakage calculation, including any deduction percentage and the underlying justification, and clarify whether a buffer pool or other reversal protection applies.

→ Resolve the issuance contradictions by reconciling the 56,233 and 129,382 figures across validation records and documenting the final authoritative issuance basis.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-D32F64A6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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