

QUALITY REPORT

"14.65 MW Wind Power Project" in Maharashtra by BF Utilities Ltd.

CDM-0792 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-285AE935 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a CDM wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a project-specific baseline, which supports a moderate integrity profile. However, leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, and the validation report records several meter/data-archiving clarifications that were only resolved through corrective actions, which weakens confidence in the documentation and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-0792
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 17
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
VVB	DNV Climate Change Services AS
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

■ The validation report says leakage was not addressed, while the PDD reportedly treated it as negligible; this inconsistency lowers reliability.

■ The validation report raised multiple monitoring and metering clarifications, including missing meter accuracy details and no check meters, even though corrective actions were later added.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a project-based baseline under AMS-I.D, which is a positive sign for CDM wind.

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent between the validation report and the PDD, and reversal risk is not addressed in the extracted record.

The validation report confirms additionality was verified by the VVB, and the project uses a project-specific baseline under AMS-I.D, which supports the core CDM design. At the same time, leakage is not consistently documented: the validation report says it was not addressed, while the PDD says it was deemed negligible, so I privileged the validation report because it is the independent assurance document and adjusted the score downward. Reversal risk is also not addressed in the extracted record, which is less critical for wind than for land-use projects but still leaves a gap.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ The monitoring and crediting periods are stated, and the VVB is identified as DNV Climate Change Services AS.

- Total verified and claimed emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and the leakage rationale is not consistently documented.

The project documents identify the VVB and provide the monitoring and crediting period, which helps traceability. However, total claimed and verified emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and the leakage rationale is inconsistent across documents. The validation report also shows that several monitoring details had to be clarified through corrective actions, which limits transparency.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is a wind project under CDM with VVB-confirmed additionality, which reduces some over-crediting concern.

- The contradiction on leakage justification and the absence of verified issuance figures create uncertainty about the robustness of the claimed reductions.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is a renewable wind installation with VVB-confirmed additionality and a CDM methodology. Still, the contradiction on leakage treatment creates uncertainty about whether the PDD or the validation report should be relied on; I privileged the validation report because it is the higher-priority independent assessment. The absence of verified issuance totals in the extracted record also makes it harder to judge over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Four documents were used, including a validation report and PDD, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- The validation report lists several clarifications on metering, data archiving, and emergency preparedness, showing that the original documentation was incomplete.

Documentation is reasonably complete but not strong: four documents were used, and the extraction confidence is medium. The validation report lists several clarifications, including missing meter accuracy information, missing meter-point details, and data archiving language that had to be added in the revised PDD. That suggests the file was usable but not fully polished at the validation stage.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage rationale inconsistent
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide a consistent, document-level explanation of leakage treatment and reconcile the PDD with the validation report.
- Publish the verified emission reduction totals and complete monitoring evidence, including meter specifications, archiving provisions, and any issuance records.

Documents Reviewed

- 01 Apr 2014 - 31 Dec 2020
- crediting period renewal form
- project design document
- Validation opinion

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-285AE935 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy