


## QUALITY REPORT

# 4 MW Biomass based cogeneration plant by Godrej Agrovet Ltd.

VCS-1744 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-8F3DDFBA · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

## Assessment Summary

This is a reasonably well-documented VCS biomass cogeneration project with VVB-verified additionality, no reported material findings, and matching claimed versus verified issuance in the monitoring period. The main weaknesses are incomplete leakage and permanence evidence, plus a contradiction in the record on leakage treatment and historical ERR totals that reduces confidence somewhat.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1744
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.C 20
Crediting Period	2018 — 2028
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	42,407 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	16 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

## Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the monitoring report says leakage is deemed negligible, while the validation report says it was not addressed.
- Historical ERR totals differ between validation documents, which suggests some record inconsistency even though the latest figures match.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 7.2 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring report.
- Leakage evidence is mixed: the monitoring report says leakage is deemed negligible, but the validation report records it as not addressed.

The project scores moderately well on integrity because additionality was tested through an investment test and confirmed by the VVB, and the monitoring report reports no material findings or corrective actions. However, permanence and leakage are not fully evidenced: buffer pool coverage is not stated, reversal events are not found in the extracted record, and leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents. The monitoring report dated 2022-08-04 says leakage is deemed negligible, while the validation report dated 2022-08-12 says leakage was not addressed; I privileged the later monitoring report for the project's current accounting, but the contradiction still weakens confidence.

### Transparency — 6.4 / 10

- + The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period and shows claimed and verified ERRs both at 42,407.
- Usage monitoring details are not stated in the available documents, and the leakage rationale is not consistent across reports.

Transparency is fair but not strong. The monitoring report clearly states the monitoring period from 2020-07-01 to 2021-09-30 and shows total ERRs claimed and verified at 42,407, which supports traceability. At the same time, usage monitoring methodology is not stated in the available documents, and the leakage rationale is not consistently documented across reports, which limits full MRV clarity.

### Claim Safety — 6.1 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline under AMS-I.C, and the latest monitoring report shows no gap between claimed and verified ERRs.
- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a project baseline under AMS-I.C and the latest monitoring report shows no difference between claimed and verified ERRs. The leakage justification is only partly reliable because of the contradiction between documents, and the extracted record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status. That means the risk of over-claiming or dual-market use cannot be fully excluded from the available evidence.

### Documentation — 7.0 / 10

- + The record includes multiple official documents, with 16 documents used and high extraction confidence.
- Baseline reassessment timing is not stated, and no buffer pool percentage is available in the extracted facts.

Documentation quality is fairly good overall. The extracted record cites multiple official documents, includes a named VVB, and has high extraction confidence, which supports reliability. Still, some important items are missing or not stated, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and usage monitoring method, so the documentation is not complete enough for a top score.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer pool stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Negligible claim but inconsistent
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a consistent, quantified leakage assessment across validation and monitoring documents, including the basis for any negligible-leakage claim.

→ Disclose buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment history, and any registry or market-eligibility status relevant to CORSIA or CCP claims.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- 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-8F3DDFBA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy