QUALITY REPORT

8MW biomass based power plant at Phagwara

VCS-636 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-B6192778 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	6.3

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-verified emission reductions (227,187 tCO2e) and no reported material findings or reversals, which supports basic credibility. However, key integrity elements are weakly evidenced in the extracted record—especially leakage treatment and baseline reassessment—while the monitoring report triggered numerous corrective actions, indicating MRV and reporting quality issues.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-636
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.C 13
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	227,187 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (not addressed vs deemed negligible), increasing over-crediting risk for a biomass supply chain project.

- Extensive corrective actions in the monitoring report (templates, missing commissioning/technical specs, calibration evidence, monitoring equipment details) indicate MRV/documentation weaknesses.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2022-08-19) reports no material findings and no reversal events, and the VVB verified the same total ER as claimed (227,187 tCO2e).

- Leakage is not robustly treated in the extracted record (no quantified deduction and inconsistent justification across documents), and baseline reassessment timing is not stated.

Additionality is stated as confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, supporting a baseline integrity check, but the specific additionality test type is not stated. The baseline is project-specific (AMS I.C v13), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents. Leakage is a key weakness: no leakage deduction is provided and the monitoring report (2022-08-19) indicates leakage was not addressed, which is problematic for biomass projects where feedstock sourcing can create displacement effects. Permanence risk is low for an energy project and the monitoring report (2022-08-19) reports no reversals.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The VVB is identified (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. / Applus+), and claimed ER equals verified ER for the stated monitoring period (2012-12-01 to 2018-09-30).

- The monitoring report (2022-08-19) required many corrective actions and missing evidence (e.g., calibration certificates, monitoring equipment details), reducing MRV transparency.

The monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-12-01 to 2018-09-30) and the monitoring report (2022-08-19) shows the same total emission reductions claimed and verified (227,187 tCO2e). The VVB is clearly identified as Applus+ (LGAI Technological Center, S.A.). However, the monitoring report (2022-08-19) includes numerous corrective actions about missing evidence and non-conformance with the VCS monitoring report template, which reduces confidence in the transparency and quality of MRV disclosures.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ ERs were verified by the VVB with no discrepancy between claimed and verified totals in the monitoring report (2022-08-19).

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage handling is inconsistent, elevating greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Over-crediting risk is moderated by the fact that claimed and verified ER totals match in the monitoring report (2022-08-19), but weakened by inconsistent leakage treatment and lack of a quantified leakage deduction. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks. The project uses a project-specific baseline approach (AMS I.C), and the grid emission factor year is not stated, which adds uncertainty around baseline parameter currency.

Documentation — 6.3 / 10

+ Multiple document types are present in the extracted record (validation report, monitoring report, issuance), with high extraction confidence.

- The monitoring report (2022-08-19) lists extensive corrective actions requesting core evidence (commissioning certificates, technical specs, calibration records), indicating incomplete documentation at assessment time.

The extracted record includes several document types (validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting basic completeness. Nonetheless, the monitoring report (2022-08-19) lists extensive corrective actions requesting fundamental supporting documents (commissioning certificates, technical specifications, calibration certificates, monitoring equipment details, stakeholder consultation/grievance records). This indicates that, at least at the time of assessment, documentation and evidence packages were incomplete or not well organized.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality (test type not specified)
● **Permanence**	Energy project with no reversals reported
● **Leakage**	Leakage not quantified and justification inconsistent
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards and grievance mentioned; FPIC/benefit sharing not
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a quantified leakage assessment (or a documented, evidence-based justification for negligible leakage) tied to biomass feedstock sourcing and any displacement effects, consistently across validation and monitoring.

→ Close the monitoring report corrective actions with publicly available supporting evidence (commissioning certificates, technical specs, calibration certificates, monitoring equipment details, stakeholder consultation and grievance records) and update the MR to the correct VCS template.

Documents Reviewed

• Issuance Representation
• Monitoring Report
• Verification Representation
• Verification Report

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-B6192778 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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