

QUALITY REPORT

AAC Block Project By Aerocon Buildwell Pvt. Ltd. (Ekiesl- June 2016-02)

VCS-1549 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-D24FA964 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some core integrity elements in place (VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage approach), and recent monitoring documentation reports no material findings. However, key quantitative fields are missing (claimed ERR, leakage deduction, baseline reassessment timing), and multiple cross-document contradictions reduce confidence in the reliability of the record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1549
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS III.Z 6.03
Crediting Period	2014 — 2024
VVB	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	119,115 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	33 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Verified emission reductions are inconsistent across documents (119,115 vs 40,695), creating over-/under-crediting and reporting reliability risk.
- Additionality approach is contradictory between documents (barrier vs investment test), weakening confidence in additionality robustness.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

- + The monitoring report states additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings or corrective actions.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment and the leakage deduction percentage are not stated in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2025-03-06) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings and no corrective actions. The baseline is described as project-specific, and the extracted record does not state when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens baseline robustness. Leakage is described as quantified, but the monitoring/verification record provided here does not state the leakage deduction percentage, leaving uncertainty on whether leakage was conservatively treated. Buffer pool and reversal information are not found in the extracted record, which is a gap even for an avoidance project.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

- + The project identifies the VVB (VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.) and provides a clear monitoring period (2023-05-01 to 2024-07-14) with verified ERs reported.
- The claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record and there are contradictions across documents on key disclosures (safeguards, grievance mechanism, FPIC).

The monitoring report (2025-03-06) provides a defined monitoring period (2023-05-01 to 2024-07-14) and reports verified emission reductions of 119,115 tCO₂e. The VVB is named (VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.), supporting traceability. However, the claimed emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to check claimed-versus-verified consistency. Multiple contradictions between the validation and monitoring documentation on safeguards-related disclosures reduce transparency confidence.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream aviation-claim risks.
- Contradictory verified ER figures and missing leakage deduction/usage monitoring details increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

The extracted record states the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of aviation-related double-claim pathways. At the same time, the verified ER quantity is contradictory across documents (119,115 vs 40,695), which elevates over-crediting/greenwashing risk because users cannot easily reconcile what was actually verified. Leakage is said to be quantified, but without a stated leakage deduction percentage and without usage monitoring details in the extracted record, it is hard to judge conservativeness. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity claims screening.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + A relatively large document set was used (24) including PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance, and the latest monitoring report is dated 2025-03-06.
- Extraction confidence is only medium and several key fields remain missing or inconsistent across documents.

The evidence set is reasonably broad (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and the latest monitoring report is recent (2025-03-06), which supports documentation strength. The minimum extraction confidence is medium, implying some readability/structure limitations that can propagate missing fields. Several key quantitative items are not found in the extracted record (claimed ERs, leakage deduction percentage, baseline reassessment timing), reducing completeness. Contradictions between older validation documentation (2016-07-09) and the newer monitoring report (2025-03-06) also indicate record-management and consistency issues.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed but test type inconsistent across documents
● Permanence	Avoidance project but buffer/reversal details not evidenced in extracted record
● Leakage	Leakage said to be quantified but deduction value not stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance reported later but contradicted by validation
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled ER table (claimed vs verified vs issued) for the monitoring period and explain the 119,115 vs 40,695 discrepancy with document references.

→ Disclose the leakage deduction percentage and calculation details, and document baseline reassessment timing/updates to strengthen conservativeness and auditability.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Proof of Contracting
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Validation 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-D24FA964 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy