QUALITY REPORT

10 MW Manjanadka Hydro project, Karnataka, India

CDM-9467 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-A7048E8D · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.4

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	4.8
Transparency (25%)	4.1
Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism, but the evidence base is thin and several key safeguards and accounting details are not fully stated. The biggest concerns are the lack of quantified leakage treatment, no buffer pool information, and multiple material findings in the validation report, which reduce confidence in the crediting claims.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-9467
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D Version 17
Crediting Period	2013 — 2022
VVB	TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

■ The validation report lists many material findings, including multiple CARs and CLs, which suggests significant issues were identified during validation.

■ Leakage treatment is not properly documented: the report says there is no leakage associated with the project activity, but the extracted record also shows leakage justification as not addressed and no quantified deduction.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the validation report, using an investment test.

- The validation report recorded many material findings, including several corrective action requests and clarification requests, and no buffer pool or reversal treatment is stated.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test and says it was verified by the VVB, which supports the project's core crediting logic. However, the same report lists many material findings, including multiple CARs and CLs, and there is no stated buffer pool or quantified reversal treatment, so permanence and robustness are only moderate.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated for 2020, and the project is linked to a named VVB, TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd.

- Key MRV details are missing or not stated in available documents, including total ERs claimed versus verified, usage monitoring, and any quantified leakage or baseline reassessment.

The monitoring period for 2020 is clearly identified, and the project is tied to TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd, which helps traceability. But the extracted record does not state total ERs claimed versus verified, usage monitoring method, or any baseline reassessment, so the MRV picture remains incomplete.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

+ The project uses a CDM methodology, AMS-I.D Version 17, which provides a recognized accounting framework.

- The project is marked as CORSIA-eligible, but no CCP status is stated and leakage treatment is not quantified, increasing over-crediting and claim-risk concerns.

The project uses AMS-I.D Version 17 under the CDM, which is a recognized methodology, but the claim-safety picture is weakened by missing leakage quantification and no stated usage-rate evidence. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-market claim risk is not fully resolved.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ The record includes a validation report and identifies the VVB, with high extraction confidence.

- Only two evidence documents are reflected in the extracted record, and several core fields are not found in available documents, including buffer pool, verified ER totals, and baseline reassessment.

The extracted record is based on a validation report and the extraction confidence is high, which is a positive sign. Even so, only a limited set of documents appears to have been used, and several important fields are not found in available documents, including buffer pool, verified ER totals, and baseline reassessment timing.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No buffer pool stated
Leakage	Leakage not quantified
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment missing
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unstated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete monitoring and verification package showing verified ER totals, leakage treatment, and any baseline reassessment or justification for not reassessing.

→ Disclose permanence and claim-risk controls, including buffer pool treatment if applicable, reversal monitoring, and clear confirmation of CCP status or other market-claim restrictions.

Documents Reviewed

- 01 Jan 2013 - 31 Dec 2019
- 01 Jan 2020 - 31 Dec 2020
- approval
- Validation report

Report ID: CM-A7048E8D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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