

QUALITY REPORT

Biomass based steam generation project by Sterling Agro Industries Ltd.

VCS-563 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-673759C5 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.9
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards, but the evidence base is weakened by major inconsistencies in credited volumes and older monitoring-era findings. Leakage is treated as negligible, yet the record does not show a quantified deduction, and the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which limits claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-563
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.C 13
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	154,983 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Credited and verified emission reductions conflict across documents, with 154,983 shown in the later validation record versus 19,007 in earlier validation and monitoring records.
- Several corrective actions were required, including missing host country approval at the time of site visit, unclear emission equations, and incomplete biomass-use monitoring.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test, which supports the project's baseline case.
- The monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including unclear emission equations and missing biomass-fuel monitoring details, which weakens confidence in the emissions accounting.

The project's additionality is stronger than average because the VVB confirmed a barrier test in the validation record, and the baseline is at least identified as project-based under AMS I.C. However, the monitoring report also lists several corrective actions, including unclear project-emission equations and incomplete biomass-fuel monitoring, which reduces confidence in the robustness of the emissions calculations. Leakage is described as negligible, but no quantified deduction is provided, so the treatment is only partially substantiated.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a substantial set of source documents used in extraction.
- The record shows large discrepancies in reported emission reductions across validation and monitoring documents, and the leakage treatment is described as negligible without a quantified deduction.

Transparency is mixed: the record names the verifier, provides a monitoring period, and includes multiple official documents. At the same time, the documentation contains major inconsistencies in reported emission reductions, with the later validation record showing 154,983 while earlier validation and monitoring records show 19,007. The leakage justification is stated as negligible in the monitoring report, but the absence of a quantified deduction limits auditability.

Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing one channel of claim overlap risk.
- The later validation record reports 154,983 while earlier documents report 19,007, creating a serious over-crediting and consistency concern.

Claim safety is weakened by the large discrepancy in credited volumes across documents, which raises over-crediting risk and suggests the project's reported outcomes are not fully stable across reporting cycles. The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-market claim risk, but there is no CCP status stated. Because the baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed jurisdictional baseline, the overall claim position remains cautious.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + The extracted record includes multiple official document types, and extraction confidence is high.
- The monitoring report still records several unresolved corrective actions, including host-country approval, conservative parameter use, and double-accounting undertakings.

Documentation breadth is decent, with validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials reflected in the extracted record, and extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report includes several corrective actions, including missing host-country approval at the time of site visit and unclear monitoring parameters, which indicates documentation gaps in the underlying project file. The crediting-period dates also differ across documents, adding to the sense that the record is not fully harmonized.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Negligible claim without quantified deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide a reconciled emissions statement that explains the 154,983 versus 19,007 discrepancy and ties each figure to a specific reporting period and document.
- Add a quantified leakage assessment, complete biomass sourcing and monitoring details, and close out all corrective actions with clear evidence in the public record.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation

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-673759C5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy