

QUALITY REPORT

Rice Husk Fired Boiler Of 6 Ton Capacity For Process Steam Generation At Sukhbir

VCS-293 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-CC9B5766 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.1 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	1.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.3
	■ Documentation (15%)	2.1

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, key integrity and MRV elements (baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, and verified ERs) are not available, making it hard to judge whether credits are robust. With only one unidentified source document and many missing core fields, the project presents elevated over-crediting and greenwashing risk from an evidence standpoint.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-293
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Crediting Period	2010 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and any reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in avoided-emissions quantification.
- Additionality test and whether a VVB confirmed it are not found in the extracted record.
- Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) is not stated in the extracted record for a biomass fuel-switch project where supply-chain leakage can be relevant.
- No claimed or verified emission reductions are available in the extracted record, preventing a consistency check between monitoring and verification.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.6 / 10

- + No material findings or corrective actions were reported in the available document dated 2022-04-29.
- Additionality, baseline, leakage, and permanence/buffer information are not found in the extracted record.

The extracted record does not include the baseline method, any baseline reassessment date, or the additionality test used, so the core justification for avoided emissions cannot be evaluated. Leakage is also not addressed in the extracted record (no deduction percentage and no justification), which is a material gap for a biomass fuel-switch project. Permanence risk is generally lower for avoidance projects, but no buffer pool contribution or reversal provisions are stated in the extracted record. The only positive integrity signal is that the available document (dated 2022-04-29) reports no material findings and no corrective actions.

Transparency — 1.4 / 10

- + The project is identified with a VCS registry code (VCS-293) and a stated crediting period (2010-01-01 to 2016-03-27).
- Monitoring period, VVB identity, MRV methods, and claimed vs verified ER totals are not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency is weak because the VVB name, monitoring period, and MRV details (such as how biomass use was monitored) are not stated in the extracted record. The record also lacks both claimed and verified emission reduction totals, preventing basic cross-checks. While the project is clearly identified (VCS-293) and a crediting period is provided, the underlying public-facing documentation trail is not evidenced because the sole source is listed as an unknown document.

Claim Safety — 2.3 / 10

- ~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so downstream claim constraints cannot be assessed.
- Missing baseline and leakage information increases over-crediting risk for avoidance credits.

Claim safety is low because over-crediting risk cannot be bounded without a stated baseline approach, leakage treatment, and verified ER totals in the extracted record. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so buyers cannot determine whether additional claim rules or restrictions apply. The absence of any FN/RB approach or value in the extracted record further limits assessment of biomass-related accounting assumptions where relevant.

Documentation — 2.1 / 10

- Only one document was used and it is listed as "unknown," limiting traceability to official VVB/monitoring/PDD sources.
- ~ Extraction confidence is medium, but the record still lacks most core fields needed for assessment.

Documentation quality is poor: only one document was used, it is not identified beyond "unknown," and the document type is listed as "other," which limits confidence that it is a primary VVB verification/monitoring report or PDD. Many essential fields (methodology, VVB, monitoring period, ER totals) are missing from the extracted record. Minimum extraction confidence is medium, but the completeness gaps dominate the assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced
● Permanence	Avoidance type but buffer/reversal terms not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the VCS PDD and the latest VVB verification/monitoring reports showing the additionality test, baseline method, monitoring period, and claimed vs verified ER totals.

→ Disclose leakage assessment (including any deduction and justification) and the biomass fuel sourcing/usage monitoring approach to reduce over-crediting uncertainty.

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-CC9B5766 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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