QUALITY REPORT

Biogas to electricity generation group project in India

VCS-4245 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-1EF9DC2B · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.8
	Transparency (25%)	4.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS biogas project with VVB-confirmed additionality, no material findings, and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, several core MRV and credit-quality details are missing or not stated, including monitoring-period data, verified emission reductions, and reversal treatment, which limits confidence in the claim.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-4245
Sector	biogas
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS III D 21
Crediting Period	2021 — 2028
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Private Limited
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the validation report says it is quantified, while an earlier document reportedly treated it as not addressed.
- Key crediting and MRV details are missing, including the monitoring period, verified emission reductions, usage monitoring, and reversal handling.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the validation report reports no material findings.

- Reversal risk is not addressed, and the buffer pool percentage is not found in the available record.

The validation report dated 2024-05-09 confirms additionality through VVB review and reports no material findings or corrective actions. The project uses a project baseline under AMS III.D, but reversal treatment is not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is found, which weakens permanence confidence. Leakage is described as quantified in the validation report, but the record does not provide the actual deduction value.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The project has an identified VVB, TÜV SÜD South Asia Private Limited, and the validation report is recent.

- The monitoring period, verified emission reductions, and usage monitoring method are not stated in the extracted documents.

Transparency is limited by missing operational MRV details: the monitoring period, verified emission reductions, and usage monitoring method are not stated in the extracted record. The VVB is identified as TÜV SÜD South Asia Private Limited, which supports traceability, but the absence of core quantitative reporting elements reduces openness. The extraction confidence is medium, so the documentation is usable but incomplete.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline and is not a nature-based removal project, so some common permanence concerns are less relevant.

- Leakage justification is contradicted across documents, and the record does not provide verified emission reduction totals or usage-rate evidence.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is registered under VCS and has VVB-confirmed additionality, but the evidence base is incomplete for assessing over-crediting risk. The contradiction on leakage is important: the newer validation report says leakage is quantified, while an earlier document reportedly treated it as not addressed, so I privileged the more recent validation report but discounted confidence because the underlying deduction is still not shown. With no verified emission totals, usage-rate evidence, or CORSIA/CCP status, the claim cannot be treated as especially robust.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

+ Multiple evidence documents were used, including the PDD and validation report, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- Several fields are not found in the available documents, including monitoring-period details and key quantitative MRV values.

The record draws on at least the PDD and a 2024 validation report, and the VVB is named, which is a positive sign for documentation quality. FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are mentioned, but several key fields remain not found, including monitoring-period data and quantitative MRV outputs. Because extraction confidence is medium and the available record is incomplete, documentation quality is only moderate.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
Leakage	quantified but not shown
Baseline	project baseline
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the monitoring report with verified emission reductions, monitoring period, usage monitoring method, and the actual leakage deduction.

→ Provide explicit reversal treatment and buffer pool information, plus clear statements on CORSIA eligibility and CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Registration Review Report
- Registration Representation
- Listing Representation
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation

Report ID: CM-1EF9DC2B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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