QUALITY REPORT

8MW Waste Heat Recovery Based Power Project By Sree Rengaraaj Power India Private Limited

VCS-773 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-096D9FDB · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.7
	Transparency (25%)	5.1
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a real, registered VCS avoidance project with VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards, but the evidence base has several gaps and some important inconsistencies. The biggest concerns are the unresolved leakage treatment, the project-specific baseline, and the fact that the reported emission reductions differ materially across documents.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-773
Sector	industrial
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0012 3.1
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	156,573 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while the validation report later describes leakage as negligible.

- Reported emission reductions conflict between documents, with 156,573 tCO_2e in the newer records versus 104,586 tCO_2e in older validation material.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.7 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using a barrier approach and was confirmed by the VVB, which supports the project case.

- Leakage treatment is weakly documented: the monitoring report says it was not addressed, and the baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline.

The project has a positive additionality signal because the barrier test was confirmed by EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited in the validation work. However, the baseline is project-specific and there is no evidence of a recent reassessment, which is weaker than a standardized baseline. Leakage is a concern because the monitoring report says it was not addressed, even though later validation material describes it as negligible.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and the registry record shows the project is registered under VCS.

- The record does not state the usage monitoring method, and the emission reduction figures are inconsistent across documents.

Transparency is moderate because the project has a named VVB, a clear monitoring period from 2021-01-01 to 2022-05-31, and the registry status is available. That said, the usage monitoring method is not stated in the extracted record, and the reported emission reductions are not consistent across documents. The monitoring report also lists multiple corrective actions, which suggests the documentation trail is not fully clean.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ This is an avoidance project and the record says it is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces some dual-market concern.

- The baseline is project-specific, leakage justification is inconsistent, and the emission reduction totals differ materially between documents.

Claim safety is middling. The project is an avoidance project and is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers some double-claim risk, but the baseline is project-specific and the leakage treatment is inconsistent. The emission reduction total of 156,573 tCO_2e in the newer records conflicts with the older validation figure of 104,586 tCO_2e, which raises over-crediting and reliability concerns.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

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

- The monitoring report contains many corrective actions, and the crediting period is much older than the monitoring period, which weakens recency.

Documentation is reasonably broad because the extracted record draws from validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance documents, and extraction confidence is high. The project also documents FPIC, a grievance mechanism, safeguards, and benefit sharing. Still, the monitoring report lists many corrective actions, and the crediting period is far older than the monitoring period, so the file is not fully complete or current.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	Barrier test confirmed by VVB
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project with no reversal events reported
● **Leakage**	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible and no CCP approval stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and reconcile the conflicting leakage statements across documents.

→ Publish a documented reconciliation of the emission reduction discrepancy between the older validation figure and the newer monitoring/claim figure.

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-096D9FDB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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