QUALITY REPORT

*4.5 MW Biomass (low density Crop Residues) based Power Generation unit of Malavalli Power Plant Pvt Ltd. (300011)

GS-592 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-7945098E · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.8
	Transparency (25%)	5.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
	Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage treatment in at least one verification record. However, the record also shows material documentation issues, unresolved reversal treatment, and contradictions across verification documents that reduce confidence in the claimed emissions reductions. Overall, this looks like a moderately documented project with meaningful reliability concerns rather than a high-confidence crediting case.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-592
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D version 07
Crediting Period	2001 — 2008
VVB	DNV Climate Change Services AS
Verified ERs	15,036 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2007 — 2008
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	23 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- ■ The verification records conflict on credited emissions, with one report showing 15,036 verified ERs and an earlier monitoring report showing 9,211; the later verification report was privileged because it is more recent and directly reflects the final verification outcome, but the discrepancy still weakens reliability.

- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across verification documents, with one report describing leakage as quantified and an earlier one describing it as deemed negligible.

- ■ The crediting period is contradictory across verification reports, which raises concerns about record consistency and version control.

- ■ Reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is stated, which is a weakness for permanence even though this is a biomass avoidance project.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by DNV Climate Change Services AS, and the project used a combined additionality test under the AMS-I.D methodology.

- Leakage and permanence are not cleanly documented: one verification record says leakage was quantified, but no deduction percentage is stated, and reversal treatment is not addressed.

The verification report from DNV Climate Change Services AS confirms additionality using a combined test, which supports the project's core crediting logic. The baseline is project-specific and was last reassessed in 2006, but permanence is weakly evidenced because reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is stated. Leakage is also only partially supported: one verification record says it was quantified, but the deduction percentage is not provided.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and verified emissions are reported in the verification record.

- Transparency is weakened by conflicting emissions and crediting-period figures across documents, and the usage monitoring method is only described as self-reported.

The project has some transparency positives, including a named VVB, a stated monitoring period, and a verified emissions figure in the verification report. However, the record is weakened by inconsistent reporting across documents, including different verified emissions totals and conflicting crediting periods. The usage monitoring method is described as self-reported, which limits independent traceability.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline under a recognized CDM methodology, which is better than an unstated baseline approach.

- Claim safety is reduced by the lack of a stated leakage deduction percentage, missing usage-rate evidence, and contradictory verified emissions figures across reports.

Claim safety is moderate at best because the project relies on a project baseline rather than a more standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and the leakage treatment is not fully quantified in the extracted record. The absence of a stated usage-rate verification and the conflicting verified emissions figures increase over-crediting risk. The project is not shown to be CORSIA-eligible, and CCP status is not mentioned, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available record.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ The record includes multiple evidence documents, a named verifier, and a medium extraction confidence level rather than low.

- Several key fields are not stated in available documents, including buffer pool coverage, grievance mechanism, and reversal details, and there are multiple contradictions between reports.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong: there are multiple official documents and a named verifier, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low. Still, several important items are not stated in available documents, including buffer pool coverage, grievance mechanism, and reversal details. The presence of multiple CARs and a calibration delay also suggests the verification process identified operational issues that required follow-up.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
Leakage	Quantified in principle, but no deduction stated
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
Safeguards	FPIC and benefit sharing noted, grievance mechanism missing
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions and crediting-period schedule across all verification and monitoring documents, with a clear explanation of which figures are final and why.

→ Disclose a quantified leakage deduction, buffer pool treatment, and reversal management approach, along with clearer public evidence on safeguards and grievance handling.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_monitoring period_01-10-2007 to 31-07-2008_v01.pdf
- Monitoring Report_monitoring period_01-08-2008 to 30-04-2009_v04.pdf
- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01-08-2008 to 30-04-2009_v01.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01-08-08 to 30-04-09_v4.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-2009 to 30-06-2010_v01.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-09 to 30-06-10_v2.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_monitoring period_01-10-2007 to 31-07-2008_v01.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01-08-08 to 30-04-09_v4.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-09 to 30-06-10_v2.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01-10-2007 to 31-07-2008_v01.pdf
- Monitoring Report_monitoring period_01-08-2008 to 30-04-2009_v02.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-2009 to 30-06-2010_v01.pdf
- PDD_24-04-08.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-592
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-592
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-09 to 30-06-10_v3.0.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01-10-2007 to 31-07-2008.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-09 to 30-06-10_v3.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01-10-2007 to 31-07-2008.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-2009 to 30-06-2010.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01-08-08 to 30-04-09_v2.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01-08-08 to 30-04-09_v2.0.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-2009 to 30-06-2010.pdf

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-7945098E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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