

QUALITY REPORT

2.2 MW hydropower plant in Birsinghpur, Madhya Pradesh of Ascent Hydro Projects Limited (AHPL)

CDM-1280 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-DF35BBEF · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.1 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	3.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

This CDM hydropower project has limited evidence for additionality and leakage treatment, and the validation report shows multiple corrective action and clarification requests. The project appears to rely on a project baseline, but key details such as the additionality test, leakage deduction, and monitoring evidence are not stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in the claim.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1280
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 18.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2028
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- No additionality test is stated in the extracted validation record, and VVB confirmation of additionality is not found.
- Leakage treatment is not addressed, and no leakage deduction is reported for a hydropower project.
- The validation report raised three corrective action requests and one clarification request, indicating unresolved documentation issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.2 / 10

- The validation report does not state the additionality test used, and VVB confirmation of additionality is not found in the extracted record.
- Leakage is not addressed, with no leakage deduction reported and reversal risk not clearly discussed.

The project's integrity is weakened by the absence of a stated additionality test and the lack of VVB-confirmed additionality in the extracted record. The baseline is only described as a project baseline, and leakage is marked as not addressed, which is a material gap for a hydropower CDM project. The validation report also records three corrective action requests and one clarification request, which further reduces confidence in the robustness of the underlying case.

Transparency — 3.8 / 10

- + The VVB is identified as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification), and the validation report date is provided.
- Key MRV details such as the monitoring period, total ERs claimed versus verified, and usage monitoring method are not stated in available documents.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record does identify the VVB and the validation report date, but it does not provide the monitoring period, total emissions reductions claimed or verified, or the usage monitoring method. The absence of these core MRV fields makes it difficult to assess whether the public documentation is complete. The medium extraction confidence also suggests that at least one source was not fully readable.

Claim Safety — 3.1 / 10

- The baseline is described only as a project baseline, which is weaker than a standardized or recently reassessed baseline.
- ~ No CCP or CORSIA status is stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Claim safety is constrained by the weak baseline description and the lack of quantified leakage treatment. No information is provided on CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so the risk of overlapping claims cannot be excluded from the available record. Because the project is a hydropower CDM activity, missing baseline and leakage details are especially important for over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

- + At least one official validation report is available, with a named VVB and a defined crediting period from 2021-11-25 to 2028-11-24.
- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the report includes multiple CARs and a CL, suggesting incomplete or contested documentation.

Documentation quality is only moderate because there is at least one validation report and a defined crediting period, but the record is sparse on key technical fields. The presence of multiple CARs and a CL indicates that the VVB identified issues requiring follow-up. Medium extraction confidence also lowers confidence that the available record fully captures the project file.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline only
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the full validation and monitoring evidence for additionality, baseline selection, and leakage treatment, including the specific test used and VVB confirmation.
- Publish complete MRV documentation with monitoring period, verified emissions reductions, safeguard evidence, and explicit registry/claim status to reduce double-claim risk.

Documents Reviewed

- crediting period renewal form
- 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-DF35BBEF · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy