QUALITY REPORT

Bundled Biomass Based Thermal Energy Projects In U.P. & Punjab Of Sukhbir Agro Energy Limited

VCS-261 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-B00D1471 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
5.6 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.4
	Transparency (25%)	4.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
	Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-verified additionality, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism, but key MRV and crediting details are missing from the extracted record. The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, leakage is only described as negligible without a quantified deduction, and registry/usage information is incomplete, which limits confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-261
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS-I.C. 13
Crediting Period	2007 — 2017
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Leakage was described as negligible, but no quantified leakage deduction was found in the available documents.
- Monitoring-period, usage-monitoring, and verified issuance figures were not found in the extracted record, limiting transparency.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the validation report, which supports the project’s core eligibility case.

- Leakage treatment is weakly evidenced: the documents only say leakage is deemed negligible, with no quantified deduction found.

The validation report from TÜV NORD CERT GmbH confirms additionality through an investment test, which is a meaningful positive signal. However, leakage is only described as negligible and no quantified deduction is available, and the baseline is project-specific with no reassessment date found. No material findings or corrective actions were reported in the validation report, which helps, but the missing permanence and leakage detail keep the score moderate.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The validation report identifies the VVB as TÜV NORD CERT GmbH and the project uses VCS methodology AMS-I.C. version 13.

- Key monitoring and issuance fields are missing, including the monitoring period, verified ERs, claimed ERs, and usage-monitoring method.

Transparency is constrained by missing MRV and registry details in the extracted record. The project and methodology are identified, but the monitoring period, verified and claimed ER totals, and usage-monitoring method were not found. The absence of these core reporting fields makes it difficult to independently assess issuance quality.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

+ The project is an avoidance activity with a project baseline, which is generally less exposed to reversal risk than removal projects.

- The contradiction on additionality weakens claim safety: the PDD refers to a barrier test, while the validation report supports an investment test.

Claim safety is mixed because the project is an avoidance activity under VCS, but the evidence base is incomplete. The PDD and validation report disagree on the additionality test type: the PDD indicates a barrier test, while the validation report supports an investment test; I privileged the validation report because it is the later and independent VVB assessment. Leakage is not quantified, and CORSIA or CCP status is not stated, so over-claim risk remains elevated.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ The record includes at least two core document types, and the validation report is dated 2009-11-13 with a defined crediting period.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and one document is listed as unknown, suggesting incomplete document coverage.

Documentation quality is moderate rather than strong. The extracted record includes the PDD and validation report, but one source is listed as unknown and extraction confidence is only medium. The crediting period is stated, yet the monitoring period and issuance figures are missing, which suggests incomplete documentation coverage for a full quality review.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	avoidance project, buffer not stated
Leakage	negligible claimed, not quantified
Baseline	project baseline, reassessment missing
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring report with verified and claimed emission reductions, monitoring period, and usage-monitoring method.

→ Disclose quantified leakage treatment, buffer or reversal provisions if applicable, and clarify the additionality test discrepancy between the PDD and validation report.

Documents Reviewed

- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-B00D1471 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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