QUALITY REPORT

20MW Waste gas based captive power project based at Kharagpur, West Bengal

CDM-1266 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-3F6D735E · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	4.8
Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This CDM waste-gas captive power project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings in the validation report. However, key MRV and crediting details are missing, leakage is not addressed, and the record quality is weakened by low extraction confidence and a contradiction on the additionality test type.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1266
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0004 version 02
Crediting Period	2007 — 2014
VVB	SGS United Kingdom Ltd
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

■ Leakage is explicitly marked as not addressed, with no quantified deduction or justification found.

■ The extracted record has low readability confidence and a contradiction between the validation report and PDD on the additionality test type.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation report from SGS United Kingdom Ltd confirms additionality through an investment test, and the VVB also verified additionality.

- Leakage treatment is not addressed, and no buffer pool or reversal information is found in the available documents.

The validation report dated 2008-01-10 from SGS United Kingdom Ltd confirms additionality using an investment test, and the VVB verified that additionality assessment. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, which supports the project's integrity. However, leakage is marked as not addressed, and there is no evidence of a buffer pool or reversal management in the extracted record.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB and a defined crediting period in the validation report, which helps anchor the record.

- The monitoring period, verified emission reductions, and usage monitoring details are not stated in the extracted documents, limiting MRV transparency.

Transparency is limited because the extracted documents do not state the monitoring period, verified emission reductions, or usage monitoring method. The validation report does identify the VVB and the crediting period, but the low extraction confidence means some key details may be missing from the record. Overall, the documentation is only partially sufficient for a strong public MRV assessment.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

+ No material findings were reported in the validation report, which reduces immediate over-crediting concern.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized baseline, and leakage is not addressed, increasing claim risk.

Claim safety is moderate at best. The project uses ACM0004 with a project baseline, but the baseline is not described as recently reassessed or standardized, and leakage is not addressed. With no verified emission totals and no CORSIA or CCP status stated, the risk of over-crediting cannot be ruled out from the available documents.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ The record includes multiple evidence documents, including a validation report and PDD, and no corrective actions were required.

- Extraction confidence is low, and several core fields such as monitoring period and verified emissions are not found in the available documents.

The record draws on multiple documents, including a validation report, a PDD, and other extracted sources, and the project has a defined crediting period. Still, the extraction confidence is low, which lowers confidence in completeness, and several important fields are not found in the available documents. The absence of corrective actions is positive, but the overall documentation remains incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No reversal data or buffer pool stated
Leakage	Leakage not addressed
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring report with verified emission reductions, monitoring period, and usage monitoring details.

→ Document leakage treatment, reversal risk management, and any registry status relevant to double-claim risk.

Documents Reviewed

- Appendix 2 - CER calculation sheet
- approval
- Appendix 1 - Board minutes RLUL
- Appendix 3 - JPC Report Page 38
- registration request form
- Appendix 4 - Letter
- project design document
- Validation report

Report ID: CM-3F6D735E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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