

QUALITY REPORT

AAC Block Project By HIL Limited

VCS-1673 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-9D17C31E · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including a VVB-confirmed barrier additionality test, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism. However, key elements needed to judge credit quality are missing or not stated in the available record, especially leakage quantification, permanence protections, and verified issuance/usage figures.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1673
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS III.Z 06.0
Crediting Period	2015 — 2025
Monitoring Period	2015 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual deduction percentage is not stated in the available documents.
- No verified error reduction or claimed-versus-verified issuance figures were found, limiting confidence in over-crediting risk assessment.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using a barrier approach and was confirmed by the VVB in the project document.
- Leakage deduction, buffer pool coverage, and any reversal history are not stated in the available documents.

The project document supports additionality through a barrier test, and that assessment was confirmed by the VVB. FPIC and a grievance mechanism are also documented, which strengthens the safeguards side of integrity. On the other hand, leakage is only described as quantified without the actual deduction rate, and buffer pool coverage or reversal events are not stated in the available record.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

- + The project document provides a defined monitoring period and crediting period, which helps establish temporal scope.
- The VVB name, verified issuance figures, and usage monitoring method are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited by missing operational and registry details. The extracted record does not identify the VVB, does not provide verified issuance or claimed-versus-verified error figures, and does not state the usage monitoring method. The monitoring and crediting periods are clear, but the overall MRV picture remains incomplete.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project uses a project-specific baseline and a recognized VCS methodology, which is better than having no baseline information.
- No verified error reduction, leakage percentage, or usage-rate evidence is available, so over-crediting risk cannot be tightly bounded.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a recognized VCS methodology and a project-specific baseline, but the evidence base is thin on over-crediting controls. The record does not state verified error reductions, leakage deduction percentage, or usage-rate evidence, so the risk of overstated claims cannot be ruled out. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, which adds uncertainty rather than reassurance.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

- + The record shows three documents used, with no material findings or corrective actions required in the extracted PDD.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and one evidence document is unidentified, leaving gaps in documentation completeness.

Documentation quality is middling: three documents were used, and the extracted PDD reports no material findings or corrective actions. Still, extraction confidence is only medium, and one evidence document is unidentified, which reduces confidence in completeness. The project document is dated 2017, so the evidence is not especially recent relative to the full crediting period.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Barrier test VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	No reversal or buffer details stated
● Leakage	Quantified but deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the leakage deduction percentage, buffer pool treatment, and any reversal monitoring results in a verification report.

Documents Reviewed

- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Draft Project Description

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-9D17C31E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy