

QUALITY REPORT

24.8 MW Wind power project by Belgaum Wind Farms Private Ltd. in Gadag, Karnataka

CDM-1687 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-D6ADBEBE · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	3.9
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
	■ 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 project-based baseline, but the evidence set is thin and one key document was hard to read. Leakage treatment is weakly documented, and the record contains a contradiction on whether leakage was addressed, which reduces confidence in the claimed emissions reductions.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1687
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 16.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2023
VVB	Perry Johnson Registrars Carbon Emission Services Inc. (PJRCES Inc.)
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

■ Leakage justification is missing in the validation report, while a later document reportedly treats leakage as negligible; the record does not explain why the later view should override the earlier one.

■ A material finding was raised in validation, and the extraction confidence is low, which weakens confidence in the completeness of the documentation.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses the ACM0002 methodology with a project-based baseline.
- Leakage is not addressed in the validation report, and the contradiction suggests inconsistent treatment across documents.

The validation report from PJRCES Inc. confirms additionality and identifies the ACM0002 methodology, which supports the project's core integrity case. However, the baseline is project-based and the record does not show a reassessment date, while leakage is marked as not addressed in the validation report. The project is a wind avoidance activity, so permanence risk is inherently lower, but the absence of a buffer pool and the unresolved leakage treatment keep the score below strong levels.

Transparency — 3.9 / 10

- + The monitoring period is stated, and the project is tied to a named VVB, which helps traceability.
- Total ER claims and verified issuance figures are not found in the extracted record, and the low extraction confidence limits document clarity.

The monitoring period is stated as 2018-07-07 to 2020-12-31, and the VVB is named, which improves traceability. Still, the extracted record does not provide claimed or verified emission reduction totals, nor any usable monitoring details for usage or grid factors. Because the extraction confidence is low, the documentation trail appears incomplete and harder to audit.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- + The project is a wind power CDM activity, which generally has lower permanence risk than removal projects.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly reassessed standardized baseline, and leakage treatment is uncertain because of the document contradiction.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is a CDM wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality, which reduces the risk of a fundamentally weak crediting case. That said, the baseline remains project-specific, leakage is inconsistently treated, and there is no evidence in the extracted record for CORSIA or CCP status. The contradiction on leakage means the emissions claim should be treated cautiously.

Documentation — 3.4 / 10

- + Multiple evidence documents were used, including a validation report and PDD.
- One key document was poorly readable, and a material finding was recorded with no corrective actions listed.

The record draws on seven documents, including a validation report and PDD, which is a positive sign for coverage. But one key document was poorly readable, the extraction confidence is low, and a material finding was recorded without any corrective actions listed. The crediting period is stated, but the available documentation still leaves important gaps around monitoring and issuance details.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Wind avoidance project
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide a clear, dated leakage assessment or methodology update that reconciles the contradiction between documents.
- Publish verified issuance totals, monitoring calculations, and a readable full document set with any corrective actions closed out.

Documents Reviewed

- 07 Jul 2018 - 31 Dec 2020
- 19 Jun 2016 - 26 Sep 2016
- crediting period renewal form
- 27 Sep 2016 - 06 Jul 2018
- Appendix 1 - 1687 EF-ER Calculation sheet
- 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-D6ADBEBBC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy