

QUALITY REPORT

Biomass Based Power Generation Plant at Village Channu, Punjab

VCS-650 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-52DF3D61 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings, but key methodological details are missing and the monitoring package contains several corrective action requests. The credit volume was revised downward from earlier documents, and the record shows contradictions on emissions reductions and safeguards that reduce confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-650
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS ID 15
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Verified ERs	216,660 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The emissions reductions figure changed from 394,873 to 216,660 across documents, indicating a material inconsistency that needed reconciliation.
- Several monitoring-report corrective actions were still requested, including missing operating permits, boiler inspection evidence, logbooks, and calibration records.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the verification report reported no material findings.
- The baseline is described only as project-based, with no reassessment date found, and leakage is only described as deemed negligible without a quantified deduction.

The verification report supports additionality, and the extracted record shows no material findings, which is positive for project integrity. However, the baseline is only described as project-based, the last reassessment date is not found, and leakage is treated as negligible without a quantified deduction. The monitoring report also lists several unresolved corrective actions, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the emissions accounting.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

- + The monitoring period and crediting period are stated, and the VVB is identified as 4K Earth Science Private Limited.
- The monitoring report still asked for missing records and dates, and the extracted record does not state the monitoring method or usage monitoring approach.

Transparency is mixed because the monitoring period, crediting period, registry, and VVB are identified, but the record does not state the monitoring method or usage monitoring approach. The monitoring report still requested missing start and end dates in the spreadsheet, plus logbooks and calibration evidence, which suggests incomplete disclosure. The documentation is usable, but not fully complete or clean.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + The project is not shown to have double registration or dual issuance in the extracted record.
- The emissions reductions totals conflict across documents, and the claim relies on a project baseline with no quantified leakage deduction.

Claim safety is moderate rather than strong because the project uses a project baseline and does not provide a quantified leakage deduction, even though leakage is described as negligible. The emissions reductions figure changed from 394,873 in earlier monitoring and validation documents to 216,660 in later ones, and I privileged the later figures because they are more recent and appear to reflect the updated issuance package. That said, the contradiction itself lowers confidence in the claim size.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

- + Fourteen documents were used, and extraction confidence is high.
- The monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including missing consent-to-operate and boiler inspection documents, logbooks, and calibration certificates.

Documentation quality is fair: fourteen documents were used and extraction confidence is high, which supports a reasonably solid evidence base. Still, the monitoring report contains multiple corrective action requests, including missing operating permits, boiler inspection certificates, plant logbooks, and calibration records. The recency of the monitoring period is acceptable, but the package is not fully complete.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal events reported
● Leakage	Deemed negligible without quantified deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline with no reassessment date
● Safeguards	Safeguards present but earlier contradictions exist
● Double-claim	No dual-claim evidence stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a fully reconciled emissions-reductions trail explaining the change from 394,873 to 216,660 and linking it to the final issuance calculation.

→ Publish complete monitoring evidence, including operating permits, boiler inspection certificates, logbooks, calibration records, and a clearly described monitoring and usage methodology.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- 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-52DF3D61 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy