

QUALITY REPORT

10 MW Biomass based power Plant at Pollachi, Coimbatore district, Tamil Nadu

CDM-5313 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-7C138E41 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	4.3

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

Assessment Summary

This CDM biomass project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings in the validation report. However, key evidence gaps remain around leakage quantification, permanence treatment, and monitoring detail, and the extraction quality is low, which weakens confidence in the record.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-5313
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 16
Crediting Period	2011 — 2018
VVB	DNV Climate Change Services AS
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2017
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Leakage is described as negligible in the validation report, but a contradiction notes another document appears to quantify it differently, creating a reliability issue.
- No buffer pool, reversal treatment, or verified monitoring figures were found in the extracted record, and extraction confidence is low.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation report from DNV Climate Change Services AS confirms additionality through an investment test and states that additionality was verified by the VVB.

- Leakage treatment is weakly evidenced: the validation report says leakage is deemed negligible, but the extracted record also flags a contradiction with a different, quantified treatment in another document.

The validation report from DNV Climate Change Services AS confirms additionality through an investment test, and no material findings or corrective actions were reported. On the weaker side, the baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and leakage is only described as deemed negligible rather than clearly quantified. There is also no evidence in the extracted record of a buffer pool or reversal treatment, so permanence-related assurance is limited.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period and crediting period are both stated, and the project is identified as a CDM biomass project with a named VVB.

- Verified and claimed emission reduction totals are not found in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is low, limiting confidence in the completeness of the public record.

The record identifies the project, registry, VVB, monitoring period, and crediting period, which supports basic traceability. However, verified and claimed emission reduction totals are not available in the extracted facts, and usage monitoring details are also missing. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the documentation is complete and fully readable.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project uses the AMS-I.D methodology and a project baseline, which is at least a recognized CDM framework.

- Leakage is not quantified in the extracted facts, and no CORSIA or CCP status is stated, leaving residual over-crediting and double-claim uncertainty.

Claim safety is moderate because the project sits within a recognized CDM methodology and has VVB-verified additionality. Still, the leakage treatment is not robustly evidenced in the extracted facts, and the contradiction suggests one document treats leakage as negligible while another appears to quantify it. With no stated CORSIA or CCP status, dual-claim and over-crediting risk cannot be ruled out.

Documentation — 4.3 / 10

+ Multiple evidence sources were used, including a validation report and PDD, and the validation report is dated 2012 with a defined crediting period.

- The extraction confidence is low, several key fields are missing, and no corrective actions were required, which suggests limited documentary depth rather than a fully robust file.

The file includes multiple document types, including a validation report and PDD, and the crediting period is clearly stated. Even so, the extraction confidence is low, several key fields are missing, and the record does not provide verified emission totals or detailed monitoring parameters. That combination points to incomplete documentation rather than a fully auditable package.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verified emission reduction totals, leakage calculation, and monitoring methodology from the monitoring and verification reports.

→ Clarify the leakage contradiction by identifying the source document for the quantified value and add explicit permanence and registry double-claim status.

Documents Reviewed

- Appendix 3 - 5313_Annex-1.a.xls
- Appendix 1 - 5313- ER Sheet.xls
- Appendix 4 - 5313_Annex-1.b.xls
- Appendix 6 - 5313_RfR response.pdf
- Appendix 2 - 5313- IRR Sheet.xls
- registration request form
- Appendix 5 - 5313_Annex-2.xls
- approval
- project design document
- 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-7C138E41 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy