QUALITY REPORT

Biomass Based Steam Generation Project By Gujarat Ambuja Exports Ltd.

VCS-733 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-7D54A59C · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.2
Transparency (25%)	5.0
Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS biomass avoidance project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported reversal events, but the evidence base has several reliability gaps. The latest monitoring record leaves leakage unaddressed, shows many corrective actions, and the project's claimed and verified issuance figures changed materially across documents, which weakens confidence in the credit claim.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-733
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.C. 16
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	55,888 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is not addressed in the latest monitoring report, despite an earlier report describing it as negligible.
- ■ Multiple contradictions exist across documents, including the additionality test type, issuance totals, safeguards, and crediting period.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses an investment test in the validation report.

- The latest monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, and there are no buffer pool or reversal details found in the extracted record.

The validation report supports an investment-test additionality case and the VVB confirmed it, which is a meaningful positive for project integrity. However, the monitoring report dated 2022-10-05 says leakage is not addressed, and no buffer pool or reversal information was found in the extracted record, so permanence and leakage confidence are limited. The monitoring report also lists many corrective actions, which suggests unresolved implementation issues.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB and a long monitoring period documented in the monitoring report.

- The extracted record does not state the usage monitoring method, and the monitoring report lists many corrective actions.

The project has a named verifier, LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification), and the monitoring period is clearly stated. Still, the usage monitoring method is not found in the available documents, and the record does not provide a quantified leakage deduction or a clear public-facing treatment of several MRV elements. The presence of numerous corrective actions further weakens transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of double-claim risk.

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across reports, and the verified issuance total differs sharply from earlier validation and monitoring figures.

Claim safety is weakened by inconsistent treatment of leakage and by large shifts in credited volume across documents. The monitoring report shows 55,888 tCO_2e claimed and verified in the latest record, while earlier validation and monitoring documents referenced 30,964 tCO_2e, so the crediting history is not fully stable. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but CCP status is not stated.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Multiple official document types were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records.

- Several key fields are missing or only partially specified, and the extraction record notes a poorly documented set of corrective actions in the monitoring report.

Documentation breadth is moderate because the extracted record includes validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance documents, with 20 documents used overall. The extraction confidence is high, which is positive, but several important fields are missing, including buffer pool, usage monitoring method, and reversal details. The crediting period also appears to have changed between issuance and the later monitoring record, adding complexity to the documentary trail.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed but test type conflicts
Permanence	Avoidance project, but buffer and reversal details missing
Leakage	Leakage not addressed in latest monitoring
Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
Safeguards	Some safeguards present, but FPIC conflict
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, reconciled leakage assessment with a quantified deduction or a robust justification in the latest monitoring documentation.

→ Publish a document reconciliation note that explains the conflicting additionality, issuance, safeguards, and crediting-period values across the project record.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-7D54A59C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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