

QUALITY REPORT

"Forced Methane extraction from Organic wastewater", at Mandya District, Karnataka by M/s Sri Chamundeswari Sugars Ltd.

CDM-1088 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-24159256 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ 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 CDM wastewater methane project has some positive quality signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a grievance mechanism, FPIC, and no reported material findings. However, key MRV fields are missing, leakage treatment is weakly documented, and the record contains contradictions that reduce confidence in the evidence base.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1088
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS III.H version 4
Crediting Period	2007 — 2017
VVB	DET NORSKE VERITAS CERTIFICATION AS
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Leakage is not well supported: the main extracted record says leakage was not addressed, while another document later describes it as deemed negligible.
- The project is CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated, leaving some residual double-claim uncertainty.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project used a combined additionality test rather than relying only on a self-declared claim.

- Leakage treatment is weak: one document says leakage was not addressed, and the extracted record shows a 0% deduction without a clear justification.

The project scores moderately because additionality was confirmed by the VVB and the validation record indicates a combined test, which is stronger than a single unsupported claim. On the downside, the baseline is project-specific, the leakage treatment is weak, and the extracted record shows a 0% leakage deduction without a clear supporting rationale. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, which helps, but permanence is only partially relevant here because this is an avoidance-style wastewater methane project rather than a storage project.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period, methodology, VVB name, and crediting period are identified in the available documents.

- Key monitoring values are missing or not stated, including verified emissions reductions, usage-rate evidence, and the monitoring method for usage.

The available documents identify the VVB, methodology, monitoring period, and crediting period, which supports basic traceability. However, several core MRV fields are not stated in the extracted record, including verified emissions reductions, usage-rate evidence, and the usage monitoring method. The monitoring report date is also earlier than the stated monitoring period, which makes the documentation feel incomplete even though the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is not presented as having material findings or corrective actions in the extracted verification record.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and leakage justification is inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is middling because the project is CDM-registered and has VVB-confirmed additionality, but the evidence for conservative accounting is not strong. The baseline is project-specific, and leakage is inconsistently described across documents, with one source saying it was not addressed and another later source describing it as negligible. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-claim risk is not fully resolved.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

+ Multiple document types were used, including the validation report, PDD, and monitoring report, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- Some important fields remain not found in the available record, and the contradiction on leakage justification reduces documentation reliability.

Documentation quality is fair because multiple official document types were used and the extraction confidence is medium. The record includes the validation report, PDD, and monitoring report, but several key fields are missing or not quantified, including verified emissions reductions and usage monitoring details. The contradiction on leakage justification also lowers confidence in the completeness and consistency of the file.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, document-backed leakage assessment and reconcile the 0% deduction with the later statement that leakage was deemed negligible.

→ Publish complete MRV evidence for verified emissions reductions and usage monitoring, including the missing quantified values and supporting calculations.

Documents Reviewed

- revised monitoring plan
- 27 Jul 2007 - 31 Dec 2008
- 01 Jan 2009 - 31 Dec 2010
- approval
- 01 Jan 2011 - 31 Dec 2012
- Appendix 2 - ER calculations
- registration request form
- Appendix 1 - IRR calculations
- project design document
- validation report of revised monitoring plan
- Validation 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-24159256 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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