

QUALITY REPORT

Reducing Gas Leakages within the Karnaphuli Gas Distribution Network in Bangladesh

VCS-2738 · Verified Carbon Standard · Bangladesh

Report ID: CM-E9BDCCDC · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS methane leakage-reduction project has a credible third-party confirmation of additionality and a clear monitoring period, but key integrity parameters (baseline approach and leakage treatment) are not stated in the extracted record. Multiple inconsistencies in reported/verified emission reductions across documents increase over-crediting and claims risk despite generally strong document availability.

Project Details

Registry	Verified Carbon Standard
Registry ID	VCS-2738
Sector	methane
Country	Bangladesh
Vintage	2020
Project Methodology	AM0023 04.0.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	Carbon Check
Verified ERs	871,219 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	24 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Inconsistent emission reduction totals across documents (871,219 vs 1,002,832), including an internal inconsistency within the same validation report date.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed, with no leakage deduction or justification provided in the extracted record.
- Baseline method and baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (Carbon Check).
- Baseline approach and leakage treatment are not stated in the extracted record, and ERR figures are contradictory across documents.

Additionality is reported as confirmed by the VVB, and the VVB is identified as Carbon Check in the extracted record, which supports the integrity case. However, the baseline method and the timing of any baseline reassessment are not stated in the extracted record, making it hard to judge whether the counterfactual is conservative. Leakage is flagged as not addressed and no leakage deduction is provided, which is a material gap for an avoidance methane project and increases the risk of overstated reductions.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

- + Monitoring period is clearly specified (2022-01-01 to 2022-12-31) and the VVB is identified (Carbon Check).
- Contradictory ERR values across documents reduce MRV clarity and traceability for users.

The monitoring report (2023-07-05) provides a clear monitoring period (2022-01-01 to 2022-12-31), and the project is traceable via a VCS registry code (VCS-2738). The extracted record also shows no material findings and notes that raised CARs/CLs were resolved, which suggests an auditable process. Transparency is reduced by inconsistent emission reduction totals across documents, which makes it difficult for third parties to reconcile what was claimed versus what was ultimately verified and issued.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- Over-crediting risk is elevated due to conflicting claimed/verified ERR totals and missing baseline/leakage details in the extracted record.
- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, leaving double-claim/market-eligibility risk unclear.

Claims risk is driven primarily by the inconsistent emission reduction numbers and missing baseline/leakage specifics in the extracted record, both of which can translate into over-crediting risk. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess whether the credits face additional eligibility constraints or potential double-claim concerns in certain markets. While the project is under VCS and has identified third-party involvement, the contradictions in ERR figures materially weaken confidence in marketing claims tied to a specific volume.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

- + A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 18 documents used.
- Corrective/clarification requests were raised (2 CARs and 7 CLs), indicating initial documentation or QA gaps even though they were resolved.

Documentation coverage appears relatively strong: the evidence set includes a PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance record, with 18 documents used and high extraction confidence. The monitoring report is recent (2023-07-05) relative to the 2022 monitoring period, supporting recency. However, the presence of 2 corrective action requests and 7 clarification requests (even if resolved) indicates that the documentation and/or calculations required non-trivial follow-up.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality (test type not specified)
● Permanence	Avoidance methane project; no reversals reported in extracted record
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed; no deduction or justification provided
● Baseline	Baseline method/reassessment timing not stated in extracted record
● Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned inconsistently; no FPIC or grievance mechanism evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated in available documents

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or clearly reference the baseline approach (including key parameters and when it was last reassessed) and reconcile it to the applied AM0023 methodology version 04.0.0.

→ Provide a clear leakage assessment with quantified deduction (or a documented justification for negligible leakage) and ensure consistent ERR totals across monitoring, validation/verification, and issuance records.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Review Report
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation

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-E9BDCCDC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy