

QUALITY REPORT

Biomass Based Cogeneration Project At Nectar Life Sciences Ltd

VCS-251 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-D1F06BE4 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.9Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	3.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.6
■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated investment test, but the evidence base is weakened by major gaps in leakage, permanence, and monitoring detail. The record also shows large discrepancies in reported emission reductions across documents, which reduces confidence in the claimed credits and the overall documentation quality.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-251
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS IC 15
Crediting Period	2007 — 2017
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus)
Verified ERs	166,484 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	30 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Large discrepancies in emission reduction figures across documents, including a much higher verified amount than the claimed amount in one validation record and a different claimed amount in the monitoring record.
- No leakage deduction is stated, no buffer pool is found, and reversal risk is not addressed in the extracted record.
- Safeguards are weakly documented: FPIC and grievance mechanisms are marked absent in the monitoring report, while earlier validation material appears to indicate otherwise.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project used an investment test in the validation material.
- Leakage treatment is not quantified in the extracted record, buffer pool coverage is not found, and reversal risk is not addressed.

The validation material confirms additionality through an investment test and says the VVB verified it, which supports the project's core crediting logic. However, leakage is only described as quantified without a deduction value, buffer pool coverage is not found, and reversal events are listed as not addressed, all of which weaken permanence and robustness. The project also uses a project baseline, but no reassessment date is available, so baseline strength is only moderate.

Transparency — 3.8 / 10

- + The project has multiple official documents available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records.
- The monitoring report required several clarifications and missing calculation details, and the emission reduction figures conflict across documents.

The record includes several official documents, which is a positive sign for traceability, and the VVB is named as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus). Still, the monitoring report asks for missing monitoring-period details, shutdown details, emission reduction sheets, and documentary evidence for calculations, indicating incomplete reporting. The absence of a stated usage monitoring method further limits transparency.

Claim Safety — 3.6 / 10

- + The project is marked not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of claim overlap risk.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized or recently reassessed, and the emission reduction numbers are inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is weakened by the inconsistent emission reduction figures across documents: one validation record shows a much higher verified amount than another, and the claimed amount also differs between validation and monitoring records. I privileged the later validation figure for verified reductions because it is the more recent validation document, but the discrepancy itself remains a reliability concern. The project is marked not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but the project-specific baseline and missing leakage detail still leave over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

- + The extraction confidence is high and the record includes a substantial set of source documents.
- The monitoring report contains multiple corrective action requests, and key fields such as leakage, buffer pool, and monitoring methods are not stated.

Documentation quality is mixed: there are many source documents and the extraction confidence is high, but the monitoring report still contains multiple corrective action requests. Several important fields are not stated in the available documents, including buffer pool coverage, usage monitoring method, and leakage deduction percentage. The crediting period is also long relative to the monitoring period, and the record shows conflicting safeguard statements across documents, which lowers confidence in completeness.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No buffer or reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage mentioned but deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project baseline without reassessment date
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism not documented in monitoring
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions table that explains all differences between validation, monitoring, and issuance figures, with a single authoritative crediting number.

→ Disclose quantified leakage treatment, buffer pool or reversal provisions, and complete monitoring evidence including usage method, shutdown details, and safeguard documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- 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-D1F06BE4 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy