QUALITY REPORT

Holistic development of North East India through clean energy access

VCS-3162 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-E62B4F72 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
5.7 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	4.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.3
	Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some core integrity strengths, notably VVB-confirmed additionality via an investment test and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the validation report (2024). However, key MRV and baseline/leakage quantification details are missing from the extracted record (e.g., monitoring period, usage monitoring, leakage deduction), which increases over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3162
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	VMR0006 1.1
Crediting Period	2023 — 2033
VVB	KBS Certification Services Ltd
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- ■ Crediting period dates conflict between the PDD (2022) and the validation report (2024), indicating document control/versioning risk.
- ■ Monitoring and usage monitoring details are not found in the extracted record, which is material for an energy access/demand project's ER calculation credibility.
- ■ Leakage is described as "quantified" but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation report (2024) confirms additionality using an investment test and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

The validation report (2024) confirms additionality via an investment test and indicates no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports baseline/additionality robustness. The baseline approach is project-specific, and the date of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens confidence in baseline validity over time. Leakage is described as “quantified,” but the actual leakage deduction is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about whether leakage was conservatively treated.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The VVB is identified (KBS Certification Services Ltd) in the validation report (2024).

- Core MRV fields (monitoring period, verified ERs, usage monitoring method) are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is constrained because the extracted record does not include a monitoring period, claimed or verified emission reductions, or the usage monitoring method—key elements for assessing MRV quality in an energy demand project. On the positive side, the validation report (2024) clearly identifies the VVB (KBS Certification Services Ltd). Overall, the available extracted fields do not allow cross-checking of ER calculations against monitored usage and reported issuance outcomes.

Claim Safety — 5.3 / 10

+ A specific fNRB value is provided (0.8748), supporting quantification of biomass-related impacts.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, and key inputs that drive ERs (usage/monitoring and leakage deduction) are missing from the extracted record.

Claims risk is moderate because several over-crediting-sensitive inputs are missing from the extracted record, including usage monitoring method, verified usage rate, and any leakage deduction percentage. The project reports an fNRB value of 0.8748, but the method used to derive fNRB is not stated in available documents, limiting confidence in its appropriateness. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims and labeling.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are referenced (PDD and validation report) with a recent validation report dated 2024-04-11.

- Medium extraction confidence and an internal inconsistency on crediting period reduce reliability.

Documentation is reasonably strong in that the extracted record references a recent validation report (dated 2024-04-11) and also includes a PDD, with 8 documents used overall. However, the minimum extraction confidence is only medium, suggesting some key details may not have been reliably captured. The presence of a contradiction on the crediting period also indicates document version control issues that reduce confidence in the record’s completeness and consistency.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Reversal/buffer not applicable or not evidenced
● **Leakage**	Quantified leakage claimed, deduction not evidenced
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/confirm the monitoring plan and results: monitoring period, usage monitoring method, verified usage rate, and claimed vs verified ER totals in the monitoring/verification reports.

→ Resolve document control issues by issuing a consolidated project description that reconciles the crediting period dates across the PDD and validation report, with registry updates reflecting the final dates.

→ Disclose leakage treatment quantitatively (leakage deduction percentage and calculation) and provide the fNRB derivation method/source used for the 0.8748 value.

Documents Reviewed

- Registration Review Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- SD VISta Draft Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation

Report ID: CM-E62B4F72 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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