QUALITY REPORT

Chemical Recovery Project At Satia Industries Ltd. (Sil), Formerly Known As Satia Paper Mills Limited Village Rupana, Punjab

VCS-614 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-60157CEA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
5.7 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality and matching claimed vs verified reductions in the most recent extracted record, but integrity is weakened by major MRV and calculation issues flagged as corrective actions. Leakage treatment and baseline reassessment timing are not evidenced in the extracted record, and several cross-document contradictions reduce confidence in the underlying data.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-614
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS III.M. 02 EB-33
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	117,415 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Monitoring/verification issues include missing calibration certificates, inconsistent baseline emissions between the monitoring report and spreadsheet, and missing detail on the emissions calculation process (monitoring report, 2021).
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is evidenced in the extracted record, despite a biomass/industrial fuel-switching context where leakage can be relevant.
- Contradictory ERR totals across documents (117,415 vs 39,031) indicate potential reporting/period-boundary confusion and reduce reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using a barrier analysis (validation report, 2021).

- Numerous corrective actions cite inconsistencies in baseline/project emissions and missing MRV details (monitoring report, 2021).

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation report (2021) confirms additionality using a barrier analysis and no material findings are recorded in the extracted record. However, integrity is weakened by extensive corrective actions in the monitoring report (2021), including inconsistent baseline emissions between the monitoring report and the calculation spreadsheet and missing detail on baseline/project/ERR calculation steps. Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record and no leakage deduction is evidenced, creating an integrity gap for a biomass/industrial process project. Baseline approach is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The VVB is identified (Earthood Services Pvt. Ltd.) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (monitoring report, 2021).

- Key MRV elements are incomplete/unclear (e.g., missing calibration details, missing linkage between daily/monthly data, and unclear calculation narrative) (monitoring report, 2021).

Core identifiers are present (VVB name and monitoring period in the monitoring report, 2021), and claimed and verified ERR match in the most recent extracted values. Transparency is reduced by MRV documentation gaps flagged in the monitoring report (2021), such as missing meter accuracy/calibration certificate references, missing linkage between daily and monthly data, and unclear or inconsistent parameter definitions versus the validated project description. Key quantitative inputs (e.g., grid emission factor details) are not evidenced in the extracted record, limiting independent reproducibility.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (registry extract).

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictions in ERR figures and by noted inconsistencies between the monitoring report and calculation spreadsheet (monitoring report 2021; monitoring report 2011; validation report 2021).

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims being made from these credits. Nonetheless, claim safety is moderated by over-crediting risk signals: the monitoring report (2021) flags inconsistencies between baseline emissions in the monitoring report and the spreadsheet and missing calculation narrative, and there are cross-document contradictions in total verified/claimed ERR (117,415 vs 39,031). CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on CCP screening as a backstop. Leakage treatment is not evidenced, which can further increase perceived over-crediting risk for end users.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ A relatively broad document set is available (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and extraction confidence is high.

- The presence of many corrective actions and multiple contradictions across documents suggests documentation quality/control issues (monitoring report, 2021).

The extracted record references multiple document types (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with a relatively high number of documents used and high extraction confidence, supporting a mid-to-strong documentation score. However, the monitoring report (2021) contains a long list of corrective actions requesting basic evidence (e.g., electricity bills, fuel oil records, soda recovery records, calibration certificates) and clarifications, indicating that key supporting documentation was incomplete or poorly presented at the time of assessment. Contradictions on safeguards/FPIC/benefit sharing across documents also suggest inconsistent documentation practices over time.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier analysis
Permanence	Avoidance project; reversal/buffer not evidenced
Leakage	Leakage not addressed
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards/grievance inconsistently documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear, reconciled ERR table by monitoring period showing how 39,031 and 117,415 relate (period boundaries, inclusions/exclusions) and align it with issuance records.

→ Provide complete MRV evidence packs (calibration certificates with IDs, meter accuracy classes, raw daily data with traceable aggregation to monthly totals, and a step-by-step baseline/project emissions calculation narrative) and explicitly quantify/justify leakage (including any deduction).

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- 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-60157CEA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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