

QUALITY REPORT

5MW Biomass Based Cogeneration Project At Sainsons

VCS-1547 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-57EB1F9A · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS biomass cogeneration project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported, but the evidence record has important inconsistencies. The biggest concerns are the conflicting verified issuance totals, a leakage justification that is described as not addressed in the monitoring report, and missing detail on buffer coverage and usage monitoring.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1547
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	2020
Project Methodology	ACM0006 12.1.1
Crediting Period	2017 — 2026
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Verified ERs	29,664 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The verified emission reduction total differs sharply across validation records, which raises reliability concerns about the issuance trail.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent: one document says it was quantified, while the monitoring report says it was not addressed.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports the project case.
- Leakage is weakly supported because the monitoring report says it was not addressed, and buffer pool coverage is not stated.

The project's additionality case is reasonably strong because the validation report confirms an investment test and the VVB accepted it. However, the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while the contradiction log says another validation document described leakage as quantified, so the leakage treatment is not fully reliable. No reversal events are reported, but buffer pool coverage is not stated in available documents, which limits permanence confidence.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a monitoring report with no material findings reported.
- Total verified emission reductions conflict across documents, and the usage monitoring method is not stated in available documents.

The record includes a named VVB, a monitoring period from 2020-10-01 to 2021-12-31, and no material findings in the monitoring report. Transparency is weakened by the conflicting verified emission reduction totals across validation records and by the fact that the usage monitoring method is not stated in available documents. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which is clear, but registry completeness is still limited by missing operational detail.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of double-claim risk.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and leakage treatment is inconsistent.

Claim safety is moderate at best because the project uses a project-specific baseline and the leakage story is inconsistent across documents. The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-market risk, but CCP status is not found in the extracted record. The large discrepancy in verified emission reduction totals also creates over-crediting and claim reliability concerns.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and extraction confidence is high.
- Several key items are not stated in available documents, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and usage monitoring details.

Documentation is fairly broad, with validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials among the evidence documents used, and extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report also notes that five corrective action requests were raised and resolved satisfactorily, which supports process completeness. Even so, several important items are not stated in available documents, including buffer pool percentage, baseline reassessment timing, and usage monitoring details.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversals reported, buffer not stated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible, CCP not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled issuance table that explains the conflicting verified emission reduction totals and identifies the authoritative figure.

→ Publish a clear leakage assessment, buffer pool coverage, and usage monitoring methodology in the monitoring documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- 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-57EB1F9A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy