

## QUALITY REPORT

# UK CowCredit project: A UK dairy initiative to reduce methane from enteric fermentation

VCS-2072 · VCS · United Kingdom

Report ID: CM-F67EF352 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.4**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.1</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.2</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>3.9</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>4.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS livestock project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported reversal events, but the evidence record shows several documentation gaps and multiple unresolved-quality concerns in the verification materials. The biggest issue is reliability: the extracted record contains major contradictions in verified issuance and in how key methodological elements were described, so the claim should be treated cautiously.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2072
Sector	other
Country	United Kingdom
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	VM0041 V1.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Verified ERs	2,994 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2022
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- The extracted record shows a large contradiction in verified issuance, with one source indicating 309 credits and another 2,994 credits, which raises reliability concerns about the reporting trail.
- Several material findings point to incomplete project documentation, including missing eligibility criteria, missing monitoring-method detail, and a missing KML file for the grouped project.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.1 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project used a common-practice test under the VCS methodology.
- Leakage treatment is only described as negligible, while the record also contains a contradiction suggesting another document quantified leakage; reversal risk is stated as not addressed in the extracted record.

The project has some positive integrity signals: the VVB confirmed additionality, the project uses a common-practice test, and the record says there is no non-permanence risk identified for the activity. However, the verification report also records missing eligibility criteria, missing cluster-requirement assessment, and concerns about the supplement efficacy evidence being based on a single study, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the crediting approach.

### Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The monitoring period, registry, methodology, and VVB name are stated, and the verification report records multiple CARs and CLs as closed.
- The verification report lists missing information on eligibility criteria, monitoring procedures, stakeholder consultation, and a KML file, and extraction confidence is low.

Transparency is mixed because the monitoring period, registry, methodology, and VVB are identified, and the verification report shows several CARs and CLs were closed. At the same time, the report flags missing KML files, missing stakeholder-consultation details, missing monitoring-method detail, and missing overall eligibility conclusions, while the low extraction confidence further reduces trust in completeness.

### Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

- + The project is in the UK under VCS, with a stated leakage deduction of 0% and no non-permanence risk identified for the activity.
- The record contains a major contradiction in total verified ERs and another in the additionality/leakage narrative, which weakens confidence in the claimed climate benefit.

Claim safety is weakened by the contradiction in verified issuance, where one document path indicates 309 credits while another indicates 2,994 credits; I privileged the later verification-report figure because it is the more recent and apparently authoritative extracted source, but the discrepancy itself is a serious reliability concern. The project also has a contradiction on leakage treatment and a mismatch in how additionality was characterized across documents, so the climate claim should be treated conservatively despite the stated 0% leakage deduction.

### Documentation — 4.0 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, and the verification report shows several CARs and CLs were closed.
- Extraction confidence is low, the evidence list is sparse, and key items such as baseline reassessment timing and usage monitoring details are not stated.

Documentation quality is only moderate because multiple official documents were used and the verification report shows corrective actions were raised and closed. Still, the extracted record has low extraction confidence, the evidence list is not informative, and several key items are not stated, including baseline reassessment timing, usage monitoring method, and any quantified FNRB value.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed common-practice test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No non-permanence risk identified
● <b>Leakage</b>	0% deduction with weak/contradictory support
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline; reassessment timing not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism present, but partial documentat
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clean, reconciled issuance trail that explains the 309 versus 2,994 verified ER discrepancy and identifies the final authoritative figure.

→ Publish complete monitoring and verification annexes covering cluster eligibility, animal counts, leakage rationale, stakeholder consultation, and the missing KML file.

## Documents Reviewed

- VCS-Issuance-Representation-Single-Representor\_Signed.pdf
- 2072 - VCS-Issuance-Representation-Mootral- march 20 to sept 22.pdf
- 3. VCS-Mootral-UK Monitoring-Report-26oct2020\_v5 .pdf
- VCS-Mootral-UK Monitoring-Report-25MAY2020\_FINAL .pdf
- 2072 - VCS-Mootral-UK Monitoring-Report-2020-2022 V7.pdf
- VCS-Registration-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1 (signed).pdf
- 2072 - UK project - Data monitoring March 2020 - Sept 2022 - Revised as per Verra findings 3 V4 21.06.2023.xlsx
- UK - Cow Credit Project by Mootral.kml
- Project ID 2072\_Project Review Report\_13 July 2023.pdf
- Listing Representation Mootral.pdf
- RV1\_2072\_PRR\_9SEP2020.pdf
- Proof of ownership.pdf
- 4. VCS-Mootral UK PDD-26oct2020-V5.pdf
- VCS-Mootral UK Project-Description-Template-v4.0\_ 5Dec.pdf
- VCS-Mootral UK PDD-25MAY2020-FINAL.pdf
- VCS-Validation-Representation-v4.1\_UK Dairy.pdf
- 1. Joint Val & Ver report Mootral\_FINAL\_200810 V2.2.pdf
- VCS-Ver-Representation\_UK Dairy Project.pdf
- Ver report VCS.VAL\_21May2020\_ Mootral.pdf
- CCIPL 1367 FVR v6.0 .pdf
- CCIPL 1367 deed.pdf

**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-F67EF352 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)