QUALITY REPORT

15 MW Biomass Residue Based Power Project At Ghazipur, India

VCS-624 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-2E1B4BFC · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.4
	Transparency (25%)	5.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
	Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS biomass project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record shows several documentation inconsistencies, a project-specific baseline, and leakage treatment that is described as negligible rather than quantified, which keeps confidence and claim safety only mid-range.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-624
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0006 6.2
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	403,634 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The monitoring and validation records disagree on several core items, including the additionality test, crediting period, leakage treatment, and reported emission reductions.
- Leakage is described as negligible in the monitoring report, but no deduction percentage is stated and the validation report indicates a quantified treatment, creating a reliability gap.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the verification record reports no material findings.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and leakage is not quantified in the extracted record.

The monitoring and validation materials support a reasonable integrity score because additionality was confirmed by the VVB and the verification record reports no material findings. That said, the baseline is project-specific, the last reassessment date is not stated, and leakage is only described as negligible rather than backed by a clear deduction percentage. The absence of reversal events is not confirmed in the extracted record, so permanence evidence is incomplete.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB and a clearly stated monitoring period in the monitoring report.

- Several key monitoring details are missing or inconsistent, including the claimed-versus-verified ER figures and the leakage treatment.

Transparency is moderate because the project has a named verifier, a stated monitoring period, and a verified emissions reduction figure of 403,634 in the validation record. However, the extracted record does not provide a claimed emissions total, the usage monitoring method is not stated, and the leakage treatment is not fully quantified. These gaps limit how fully an external reviewer can reconstruct the issuance basis.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.

- The baseline is project-specific and the leakage justification is only described as negligible, which leaves some over-crediting risk unresolved.

Claim safety is middling because the project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of overlapping international claims. Even so, the project uses a project-specific baseline and the leakage justification is only described as negligible, with no deduction percentage stated. The contradiction between a quantified leakage treatment in the validation report and a negligible treatment in the monitoring report also weakens confidence in the net claim.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

+ The record draws on multiple official documents, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance materials.

- The monitoring report contains numerous corrective actions and the extraction record notes at least one poorly structured source through an unknown document entry.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. The record includes multiple official sources and high extraction confidence, and the VVB is identified. However, the monitoring report lists many corrective actions, including missing calibration details, biomass assessment support, and clarification on gross generation during shutdown days, which indicates the documentation package needed substantial follow-up.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	No reversal evidence stated
Leakage	Negligible but unquantified
Baseline	Project-specific baseline
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unstated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a fully reconciled emissions accounting table that explains the discrepancy between claimed and verified reductions, plus the differing figures across validation documents.

→ Quantify leakage explicitly, document any reversal or buffer arrangements, and add a clear baseline reassessment history with supporting evidence.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-2E1B4BFC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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