

QUALITY REPORT

1.6 MW Bundled Rice Husk Based Cogeneration Plant By M/S Milk Food Limited (MFL) In Patiala (Punjab) & Moradabad (U.P) Districts

VCS-784 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-6F1CD5C4 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.4
■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This bundled rice-husk cogeneration project shows moderate integrity: additionality is confirmed by the VVB and the monitoring period and verified ERs are clearly stated. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (ER totals, crediting period, grid emission factor, and safeguards/leakage treatment) reduce confidence and increase over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-784
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	2011
Project Methodology	AMS-I.C 21
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	VKU Certification Pvt Ltd
Verified ERs	96,510 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	43 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Conflicting ER quantities across validation reports (67,742 vs 96,510) undermines confidence in the credited volume.
- Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2009–2019 vs 2019–2029), creating uncertainty about eligibility and vintage.
- Leakage treatment shifts from “not addressed” (2022 monitoring report) to “deemed negligible” (2024 monitoring report) without a consistently documented deduction.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).

- Leakage is not consistently treated across monitoring reports and no leakage deduction percentage is provided in the extracted record.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed via a barrier analysis and confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. Baseline setting is project-specific and the baseline was last reassessed in 2020, which is helpful but still less robust than a standardized/jurisdictional baseline. Leakage is inconsistently handled: an older monitoring report (2022-03-25) reportedly did not address leakage, while the newer monitoring report (2024-02-15) deems leakage negligible, and no leakage deduction percentage is stated in the extracted record.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Monitoring period (2022-01-01 to 2023-06-30) and VVB name (VKU Certification Pvt Ltd) are clearly stated in the monitoring report (2024-02-15).

- Key figures and parameters vary across documents (ER totals, grid emission factor, crediting period), reducing MRV clarity.

The monitoring report (2024-02-15) clearly states the monitoring period (2022-01-01 to 2023-06-30), the VVB (VKU Certification Pvt Ltd), and shows claimed and verified ERs aligning at 96,510 in the extracted record. However, transparency is weakened by conflicting values across official documents, including ER totals and key parameters like the grid emission factor. The presence of multiple CARs/CRs across audits (all closed) and a Forward Action Request to be checked later suggests recurring issues that can reduce user confidence in MRV consistency.

Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, lowering aviation-claims and double-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by inconsistent grid emission factors (0.84 vs 0.94193) and inconsistent ER totals across validation reports.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation-related claims and some double-claim channel concerns. Still, over-crediting/claims risk is increased by contradictions in ER quantities (67,742 vs 96,510 across validation reports) and by differing grid emission factors (0.84 in the validation report dated 2020-03-31 vs 0.94193 in the monitoring report dated 2024-02-15). CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (29 documents including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Numerous CARs/CRs and a Forward Action Request indicate recurring documentation/QA issues even if items were closed.

Documentation coverage appears relatively strong: the extracted record references a PDD, monitoring report(s), validation report(s), and issuance, with 29 documents used and high extraction confidence. However, the record shows repeated corrective/clarification requests across assessments and at least one Forward Action Request pending verification in future periodic verifications, indicating ongoing QA/control needs. The number of contradictions across documents also suggests version control and document consistency issues despite the breadth of documentation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Inconsistent treatment; deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing limited
● Safeguards	Safeguards reported in newer docs but inconsistent historically
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note (or updated verification statement) explaining why ER totals differ across validation reports (67,742 vs 96,510) and which figure is authoritative for issuance.

→ Resolve and document the crediting-period discrepancy (2009–2019 vs 2019–2029) with registry-linked evidence and consistent updates across PDD/monitoring/validation documents.

→ Provide a consistent leakage assessment across monitoring reports, including an explicit leakage deduction percentage (even if 0%) and a documented justification aligned to the methodology.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-6F1CD5C4 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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