

QUALITY REPORT

2.5 MW Rice husk based cogeneration plant at Hanuman Agro Industries Limited

CDM-1667 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-D89B5965 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

This CDM biomass cogeneration project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage treatment, but the evidence base is thin and several key safeguards and baseline details are not stated in the extracted record. The validation report also lists multiple findings and required corrective actions, which lowers confidence in the project documentation and claim robustness.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1667
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS I.C 22
Crediting Period	2022 — 2029
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Multiple validation findings were raised, including one corrective action requiring copies of the latest pollution-control consent and another requiring the PDD description to be reframed.
- Key MRV and risk items are not stated in the available record, including the monitoring period, buffer pool treatment, leakage deduction percentage, and public claim-eligibility status.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the validation report from LGAI Technological Center / Applus+ Certification.
- The validation report records CAR 01, CL 01, and FAR 01, and the baseline is only described as project-based with no reassessment timing stated.

The validation report confirms additionality through VVB review, which supports the project's core eligibility case. However, the baseline is only described as project-based, the baseline was not shown to have been reassessed, and the report includes CAR 01, CL 01, and FAR 01, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the design and implementation evidence.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The validation report identifies the VVB and the project crediting period is stated as 2022-11-07 to 2029-11-06.
- The monitoring period, total verified versus claimed emission reductions, and usage monitoring method are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record does not provide the monitoring period, claimed versus verified emission reductions, or the usage monitoring method. The VVB is identified and the crediting period is stated, but the overall MRV picture remains incomplete in the available documents.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + Leakage is at least described as quantified, which is better than no leakage treatment at all.
- The leakage deduction percentage, baseline reassessment, and CORSIA or CCP status are not stated, leaving over-crediting and dual-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is moderate at best: leakage is described as quantified, but the actual deduction percentage is not stated, so it is not possible to judge whether the treatment was conservative. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, and the project-specific baseline plus missing reassessment information leave residual over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

- + Two documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- Several core fields are missing from the available documents, and the validation report is not fully clean because it includes multiple findings and corrective actions.

Documentation quality is middling because two documents were used and extraction confidence is medium, but important fields remain absent from the record. The validation report also required corrective actions, including obtaining the latest pollution-control consent and reframing the PDD description, which suggests the file was not fully complete at validation time.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal/buffer detail stated
● Leakage	Leakage quantified but deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project baseline without reassessment detail
● Safeguards	Safeguards not documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full monitoring report with claimed and verified emission reductions, monitoring period, and usage monitoring method.

→ Disclose the leakage deduction percentage, baseline reassessment history, and clear public status on CORSIA eligibility and any CCP-style approval.

Documents Reviewed

- crediting period renewal form
- Validation opinion

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-D89B5965 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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