QUALITY REPORT

Reducing Gas Leakages within the Titas Gas Distribution Network in Bangladesh - CER Conversion

VCS-2478 · Verified Carbon Standard · Bangladesh

Report ID: CM-004AC8C3 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	Documentation (15%)	6.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality and uses an established CDM methane leakage reduction methodology, but key integrity elements (leakage treatment, baseline reassessment timing, permanence provisions) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record. Multiple internal inconsistencies across documents (crediting period and ERR totals) and several corrective actions requested by the auditor increase over-crediting and reporting-risk concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verified Carbon Standard
Registry ID	VCS-2478
Sector	methane
Country	Bangladesh
Vintage	2018
Project Methodology	AM0023 04.0.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2027
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Private Limited
Verified ERs	4,049,551 tCO_2e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	43 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Conflicting total emission reduction figures across validation/verification documents, indicating data reliability risk.
- ■ Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record and no leakage deduction is stated.
- ■ Crediting period dates conflict between monitoring and validation documents.
- ■ Corrective actions include mismatched leak counts, uncertainty inconsistencies, and a methane GWP choice flagged as potentially non-compliant with applicable guidance.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test.

- Leakage treatment is not evidenced (no justification and no stated deduction), and baseline reassessment timing is not found in the extracted record.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation/verification documentation indicates a combined additionality test and that additionality was confirmed by the VVB. However, the monitoring report does not evidence any leakage assessment or deduction, and the extracted record does not show when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens confidence in baseline validity over time. No buffer pool contribution is stated and reversal information is not found in the extracted record; while this is an avoidance methane project (lower reversal risk than removals), the absence of explicit permanence/risk provisions still reduces robustness.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ A named VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia Private Limited) and a defined monitoring period (2019-11-08 to 2020-12-31) are provided in the monitoring report.

- Numerous corrective actions in the monitoring report point to MRV and reporting gaps (e.g., leak count mismatch, missing calibration listing, uncertainty mismatch).

The monitoring report (2021-02-09) provides a clear monitoring period (2019-11-08 to 2020-12-31) and identifies the VVB as TÜV SÜD South Asia Private Limited. Transparency is weakened by the volume and nature of corrective actions in the monitoring report, including requests to reconcile leak counts, document instrument calibration details, and align uncertainty values between the monitoring report and calculation sheets. The extracted record also lacks key quantified MRV elements (e.g., leakage deduction, baseline reassessment date), limiting reproducibility from the public-facing data captured here.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain double-claiming/eligibility-related marketing risks.

- Contradictory ERR totals and auditor-raised issues (including methane GWP selection and uncertainty inconsistencies) elevate over-crediting and misstatement risk.

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain eligibility-based claims. Nonetheless, over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory total emission reduction figures across documents and by auditor-identified issues in the monitoring report, including uncertainty mismatches and a flagged methane GWP choice that may not align with the applicable guidance referenced by the auditor. The absence of an evidenced leakage treatment further increases the risk that credited reductions could be overstated.

Documentation — 6.6 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (33 documents) with high extraction confidence.

- The extracted record shows multiple unresolved corrective actions and includes an “unknown” document type, reducing confidence in completeness/consistency.

Documentation coverage is moderate-to-good given 33 documents used and high extraction confidence, and the monitoring report is relatively recent (2021-02-09). However, the monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions that indicate documentation and internal consistency gaps (e.g., missing calibration inventory, unclear data flow description, and calculation procedure clarifications). The presence of an “unknown” document type in the evidence list and multiple cross-document inconsistencies reduce confidence that the record is fully coherent.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed combined test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project but risk provisions not evidenced
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed / no deduction evidenced
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not evidenced
● **Safeguards**	No FPIC/grievance/safeguards evidenced
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or clearly reference a leakage assessment (and any deduction) consistent with the methodology, including justification for any 0% leakage claim if applicable.

→ Resolve and document all corrective actions from the monitoring report (leak count reconciliation, calibration inventory, uncertainty alignment, baseline calculation procedure, and methane GWP basis) and issue an updated, consistent set of ERR totals and crediting period dates aligned with the registry.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Verification Report
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-004AC8C3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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