QUALITY REPORT

Shree Nakoda Ispat Ltd 12MW Biomass Power Generation Project

VCS-876 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-E312C5A5 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	6.6
Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS biomass grid-connected power project shows moderate integrity: additionality is supported by an investment test confirmed by the VVB, and the verified ERs match the claimed ERs for the monitoring period. However, baseline and leakage treatment rely on project-specific assumptions with an internal inconsistency on whether leakage was quantified or merely deemed negligible, and safeguards are weakly evidenced in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-876
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I D 13
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	DNV Climate Change Services AS
Verified ERs	68,566 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2010
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (quantified in the validation report vs deemed negligible with 0% deduction in the monitoring report), increasing over-crediting risk.

■ Safeguards and stakeholder protections appear weak (no FPIC and no grievance mechanism found in the extracted record), with a contradiction on whether safeguards were mentioned at all.

■ Crediting period dates conflict between documents, indicating basic data reliability issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The verification/monitoring documentation reports an investment additionality test confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2011).

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents (monitoring report, 2011).

The monitoring documentation indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB DNV Climate Change Services AS (monitoring report, 2011). The baseline is described as project-specific rather than standardized, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents (monitoring report, 2011). Leakage is applied as a 0% deduction with a “deemed negligible” rationale in monitoring, but the validation record indicates leakage was quantified, which weakens confidence in conservative accounting (monitoring report, 2011; validation report, 2011).

Transparency — 6.6 / 10

+ Claimed and verified emission reductions match (68,566 tCO■e) for the stated monitoring period (monitoring report, 2011).

- Key MRV/context fields are missing in the extracted record (e.g., grid EF year and usage monitoring method), limiting reproducibility (monitoring report, 2011).

For the monitoring period 2009-01-27 to 2010-10-21, the project’s claimed ERs equal the verified ERs (68,566 tCO■e), which supports MRV clarity for that issuance slice (monitoring report, 2011). The VVB is identified (DNV), and key parameters like the grid emission factor are provided (0.7959), but the grid EF vintage year is not stated in available documents, limiting traceability (monitoring report, 2011). The extracted record also lacks details on usage monitoring methods, which reduces transparency on operational data controls (monitoring report, 2011).

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

- Leakage is treated as 0% with “deemed negligible” justification in monitoring, but described as quantified in validation, creating over-crediting/greenwashing risk (monitoring report, 2011; validation report, 2011).

~ CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so downstream claim eligibility and double-claim risk cannot be screened (registry record extracted set).

Over-crediting risk is moderate because leakage is taken as 0% and justified as negligible in monitoring, while the validation report characterizes leakage as quantified; this inconsistency makes it unclear whether leakage was conservatively handled (monitoring report, 2011; validation report, 2011). The baseline is project-specific, which generally carries higher discretion than standardized baselines and can increase claim risk if assumptions are not periodically reassessed (monitoring report, 2011). CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess eligibility-related reputational risk from the extracted record alone.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are present (monitoring report, validation report, and PDD) and extraction confidence is high.

- Contradictions on core descriptors (crediting period, safeguards mention, leakage framing) reduce confidence in document consistency.

The extracted record includes a monitoring report, validation report, and PDD, with seven documents used and high extraction confidence, supporting a relatively strong documentation score. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the monitoring documentation, which suggests no major non-conformities were recorded for that period (monitoring report, 2011). However, internal inconsistencies across documents on leakage framing, safeguards mention, and crediting period dates reduce confidence in the coherence of the document set (monitoring report, 2011; validation report, 2010/2011).

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversal risk evidenced
● **Leakage**	0% deduction with inconsistent justification
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	No FPIC/grievance evidenced; inconsistent disclosure
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, consistent leakage assessment across validation and monitoring, including whether leakage was quantified and the evidence supporting a 0% deduction.

→ Publish/append safeguards evidence (stakeholder consultation outcomes, FPIC where relevant, and a functioning grievance mechanism) and ensure consistent reporting across documents.

→ Clarify and correct the crediting period vs monitoring period dates in the public documentation and registry metadata, and disclose the grid emission factor vintage year and calculation references.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification 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-E312C5A5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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