

QUALITY REPORT

Biomass Cogeneration Plant By SCOUL

VCS-2977 · VCS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-C7286A67 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some solid elements, including VVB-verified additionality, FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and no reported material findings. However, key MRV details are missing from the extracted record, and the leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, which weakens confidence in the claimed reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2977
Sector	biomass
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0006 15.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2031
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is contradictory: the monitoring report describes a quantified approach, while the validation report says leakage was not addressed.
- Public-facing claim safety is limited by missing registry/eligibility information, including no stated CORSIA or CCP status and no verified usage monitoring details.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring report.
- Leakage treatment is disputed across documents, with the monitoring report describing it as quantified but the validation report saying it was not addressed.

The monitoring report confirms an investment-test additionality assessment and says it was verified by the VVB, which supports the project case. The report also notes no material findings and no corrective actions required, but the absence of buffer pool information and reversal details leaves permanence less well evidenced. The leakage treatment is a material weakness because the monitoring report describes a quantified approach while the validation report says leakage was not addressed.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period, crediting period, methodology version, and VVB name are stated in the extracted documents.
- Key MRV fields are missing, including verified issuance totals, usage monitoring method, and any CORSIA eligibility statement.

The extracted record provides the VVB name, monitoring period, crediting period, methodology version, and registry, which helps traceability. At the same time, the record does not state verified issuance totals, usage monitoring method, or CORSIA eligibility, all of which limit public transparency. The extraction confidence is high, but the underlying disclosure remains incomplete for key MRV elements.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline under ACM0006, and the monitoring report reports no material findings.
- Claim safety is weakened by missing verified emission reduction totals and by the leakage contradiction between documents.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a recognized methodology and the monitoring report reports no material findings. However, the lack of verified emission reduction totals and the unresolved leakage discrepancy increase over-crediting risk. With no stated CORSIA or CCP status, the project cannot be treated as especially claim-safe for external use.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence.
- Some important values are not stated in the available record, and the contradiction on leakage reduces documentation reliability.

Documentation quality is reasonably good because eight documents were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and extraction confidence is high. The project also has recent monitoring documentation from 2023 covering a 2021 monitoring period. Still, several important fields are not stated in the available documents, and the leakage contradiction reduces reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No buffer or reversal detail stated
● Leakage	Quantified in one document, contradicted in another
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish a reconciled leakage assessment that explains the difference between the monitoring and validation reports and states the final applied deduction.
- Disclose verified issuance totals, usage monitoring procedures, and explicit CORSIA/CCP status in the registry and monitoring package.

Documents Reviewed

- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- 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-C7286A67 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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