QUALITY REPORT

20 MW Bagasse Based Co-generation Power Project at Bannari Amman Sugars Limited, Nanjangud, Karnataka

CDM-1574 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-0DAB9866 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	7.2
Transparency (25%)	4.8
Claim Safety (25%)	6.1
Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a CDM bagasse cogeneration project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings in the validation report, which supports a moderate-to-strong integrity profile. However, key MRV details are missing from the extracted record, and the low extraction confidence reduces trust in the documentation. The project appears safer than many biomass credits, but the evidence base is incomplete for a high-confidence claim.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1574
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0006 version 4
VVB	SGS United Kingdom Ltd
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

■ Leakage treatment is only described as negligible, with no quantified deduction found in the extracted record.

■ No verified monitoring-period totals or registry issuance figures were available, limiting transparency and over-crediting checks.

■ The extraction confidence is low, so at least one key document was poorly readable.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 7.2 / 10

+ The validation report from SGS United Kingdom Ltd confirms additionality through a barrier test, and the VVB explicitly verified it.

~ The project uses ACM0006 with a project baseline, but the extracted record does not show a quantified leakage deduction or any buffer pool provision.

The validation report from SGS United Kingdom Ltd confirms additionality using a barrier test, which is a meaningful positive signal for a CDM biomass project. The project also reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, but the extracted record does not provide a buffer pool, quantified leakage deduction, or any reversal treatment beyond 'not addressed,' so permanence and leakage confidence are limited.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The validation report is identified and dated 2008-10-24, with five documents used in extraction and no material findings reported.

- Core MRV fields such as the monitoring period, verified emission reductions, and usage monitoring method were not found in the available record.

Transparency is constrained by missing MRV specifics: the monitoring period, verified and claimed emission reduction totals, and usage monitoring method were not found in the extracted record. The validation report is dated 2008-10-24 and five documents were used, but the low extraction confidence indicates at least one source was difficult to read, which further weakens documentation reliability.

Claim Safety — 6.1 / 10

+ The project is a biomass cogeneration activity under CDM, and leakage is described as negligible in the validation material.

~ CORSIA eligibility is marked true, but no CCP status or verified issuance totals were available, leaving some residual double-claim and over-crediting uncertainty.

The project is a bagasse cogeneration CDM activity under ACM0006, which generally supports a plausible baseline and lower leakage risk than many land-use projects. Still, leakage is only described as negligible rather than quantified, and the record does not provide verified issuance totals or CCP status, so over-crediting and claim-safety confidence remain moderate rather than strong. CORSIA eligibility is marked true, which increases the need for careful claim controls.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ The record includes a named VVB, a dated validation report, and evidence that FPIC, grievance mechanisms, safeguards, and benefit sharing were described.

- The extraction confidence is low, and several important fields are missing or not stated, including monitoring-period data and crediting-period recency.

Documentation quality is mixed: the record identifies a specific VVB, a dated validation report, and supporting safeguards such as FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and benefit sharing. However, the extraction confidence is low and several key fields are missing or not stated, including monitoring-period details and crediting-period recency, which lowers confidence in the completeness of the evidence set.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
Permanence	No buffer or reversal treatment stated
Leakage	Negligible leakage claimed, not quantified
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring report and registry issuance data showing claimed versus verified emission reductions for each monitoring period.

→ Disclose quantified leakage treatment, reversal/buffer arrangements, and any updated baseline or reassessment documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- registration request form
- Appendix 2 - CDM.VAL1136 MoM
- approval
- Appendix 3 - CDM.VAL1136 Tech barrier
- Validation report

Report ID: CM-0DAB9866 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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