

QUALITY REPORT

18 MW Natural Gas based community power plant and 2 MW Waste Heat Recovery system

CDM-1912 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-FC777F0B · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
■ 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

The project has some integrity support because additionality was tested through an investment analysis and the VVB confirmed it, with no material findings reported. However, key MRV details are missing, leakage treatment is not quantified in the extracted record, and the documentation quality is weakened by low extraction confidence and a date inconsistency in the crediting period.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1912
Sector	industrial
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AM0029 Version 01.1
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH JI/CDM Certification Program
Monitoring Period	2008 — 2009
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Leakage deduction is not stated in the extracted record, even though the project uses a fossil-fuel-switch methodology where leakage treatment matters.
- The crediting period is inconsistent across documents, and the lower-priority document appears to use a different end date than the validation report.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ The validation report confirms an investment-based additionality test, and the VVB is recorded as having verified additionality.

- Leakage deduction is not stated in the extracted record, and reversal handling is only described as no emergency incident in the first monitoring period.

The validation report dated 2008-06-27 states that additionality was assessed using an investment test, and it records that TÜV NORD CERT GmbH verified additionality. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, which supports the project's integrity. That said, leakage deduction is not stated in the extracted record, and reversal handling is only described for the first monitoring period rather than as a broader permanence control.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and no material findings or corrective actions were reported in the validation report.

- Total claimed versus verified emission reductions are not available in the extracted record, and usage monitoring details are not stated.

Transparency is moderate because the record identifies the verifier, the monitoring period, and the methodology version, and the validation report reports no material findings. However, total claimed and verified emission reductions are not available, usage monitoring is not described, and several MRV fields are missing from the extracted record. The low extraction confidence also reduces confidence in the completeness of the documentation trail.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

+ The project uses a CDM methodology for a fossil-fuel-switch activity, which is a recognized accounting framework.

- Leakage justification is only described as quantified, but the actual deduction is not stated, and CORSIA or CCP status is not available.

Claim safety is mixed. The project sits within CDM and uses AM0029, which provides a formal accounting basis, but the extracted record does not state the actual leakage deduction or any usage-rate evidence. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the available documents, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the record alone.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ The record includes a validation report, a named verifier, and a defined crediting period, with safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism mentioned.

- Extraction confidence is low, only one document type is clearly identified, and the crediting period shows a contradiction between documents.

Documentation quality is limited by low extraction confidence and the fact that only the validation report is clearly identified among the evidence documents. The record does include safeguards such as FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing, which is positive. However, the crediting period is contradictory across documents: the validation report gives 2008-10-01 to 2018-09-30, while another document referenced in the contradictions lists 2008-11-03 to 2018-11-02; I privileged the validation report because it is the higher-priority source for project design and crediting-period definition.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal issue clearly quantified
● Leakage	Leakage mentioned but deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring report figures for claimed and verified emission reductions, plus the actual leakage deduction and usage monitoring method.

→ Resolve the crediting-period inconsistency with a single authoritative registry or validation reference and add explicit CORSIA/CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- Appendix 5 - OPG_MD
- Appendix 3 - OPG_IRR_Coal
- approval
- registration request form
- Appendix 4 - OPG_IRR_Gas
- 03 Nov 2008 - 21 Nov 2009
- Appendix 2 - OPG_IRR_Lignite
- Appendix 1 - OPG_ER
- 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-FC777F0B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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