QUALITY REPORT

22.5 MW grid connected wind farm project by RSMML in Jaisalmer, India.

CDM-1602 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-4DB15E99 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.1

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	4.2
Transparency (25%)	4.6
Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
Documentation (15%)	3.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a CDM wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a documented validation process, but the record shows several validation issues and weak treatment of leakage and monitoring detail. The documentation is incomplete and low-confidence, and there are contradictions on additionality, leakage, and the crediting period that reduce reliability.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1602
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM 0002 Version 06
Crediting Period	2008 — 2017
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2018
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	27 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

■ The validation report lists three corrective action requests and five clarification requests, including concerns about the baseline justification and project data consistency.

■ Leakage is shown as a 0% deduction, but the justification is not addressed in the validation report and a later source reportedly described it as negligible.

■ The extracted record has low extraction confidence and a contradiction on the crediting period between the validation report and a later document.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the validation report, and the project used a combined additionality test.

- The validation report recorded three corrective action requests and five clarification requests, including concerns about the baseline choice and calculation completeness.

The validation report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB accepted it, which supports the project. However, the same report lists three corrective action requests and five clarification requests, including issues with the baseline justification, calculation completeness, and site-specific inconsistencies, which weakens confidence in the underlying integrity of the monitoring and validation process.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, Bureau Veritas Certification, and a defined monitoring period in the extracted record.

- Total verified emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is low, which weakens confidence in the documentation trail.

The project has a named verifier, Bureau Veritas Certification, and a clearly stated monitoring period, which helps transparency. But the extracted record does not state verified emission reductions, and the low extraction confidence suggests at least one key document was difficult to read, reducing trust in the completeness of the public record.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

+ The project is a wind farm under CDM with a project baseline method and a quantified grid emission factor, which is more conservative than an unstructured baseline.

- Leakage treatment is weak because the record shows a 0% deduction while the justification is not addressed in the validation report, and the record is CORSIA-eligible, which keeps dual-claim risk relevant.

The project uses a project baseline under ACM 0002 and reports a grid emission factor, but the leakage deduction is 0% while the justification is not addressed in the validation report. Because the project is marked CORSIA-eligible and no CCP status is stated, dual-channel claim risk is not eliminated, so claim safety remains only moderate.

Documentation — 3.4 / 10

+ The record includes multiple evidence documents and a detailed validation report with specific findings and corrective actions.

- The extraction confidence is low, several key fields are not stated, and the crediting period is contradicted by a later document.

The record draws on many documents and includes a detailed validation report, which is a positive sign. Still, the extraction confidence is low, several fields are not stated in available documents, and there is a contradiction on the crediting period between the validation report and a later document; I privileged the validation report for the crediting period because it is the higher-priority and contemporaneous validation source, while the later document appears secondary.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
Leakage	Zero deduction, weak justification
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, readable monitoring and verification package with verified emission totals, baseline calculations, and the missing monitoring methodology details.

→ Resolve the leakage and crediting-period contradictions with a clear, dated explanation from the most authoritative registry or verification source.

Documents Reviewed

- 02 Jan 2015 - 05 Jan 2017
- Appendix 4 - Appendix 4 Letter by Aren Associates
- Appendix 8 - Appendix 8- HT bills of 2005
- Appendix 16 - Appendix D PLF calculation of 14.8 MW project
- Appendix 5 - Appendix 5 Bloomberg data
- 11 Dec 2008 - 01 Jul 2010
- approval
- Appendix 2 - Appendix 2- IRR with CDM-RSMML(Revised)
- Appendix 10 - Appendix 10 - HT bills of 2007
- Appendix 15 - Appendix C Average beta using bloomberg data
- Appendix 9 - Appendix 9- RERC 2001 order on industrial tariff-ajmer discom
- Appendix 6 - Appendix 6 Cost of equity calculations
- Appendix 14 - Appendix B Cost of equity with BF utilities
- Appendix 13 - Appendix A Bloomberg data of BF Utilities
- Appendix 7 - Appendix 7 RSMML Note sheet 2003
- Appendix 3 - Appendix 3 CER Estimations-RSMML
- 06 Jan 2017 - 10 Dec 2018
- Appendix 12 - Appendix 12- chronology of events part II
- registration request form
- 01 Jan 2013 - 01 Jan 2015
- Appendix 1 - Appendix 1 - IRR without CDM-RSMML(Revised)
- 02 Jul 2010 - 31 Dec 2012
- Appendix 11 - Appendix 11 chronology of events part I
- project design document
- Validation report

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-4DB15E99 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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