

QUALITY REPORT

15 MW Wind Energy Project in Maharashtra

CDM-1778 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-4A06C7A7 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This is a CDM wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a standard project baseline, but the record shows weak treatment of leakage and a validation process with multiple corrective and clarification requests. The documentation is moderately complete, yet key items such as verified emission reductions, leakage rationale, and some monitoring details are missing or inconsistent, which limits confidence in the claim quality.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Registry | UNFCCC CDM |
| Registry ID | CDM-1778 |
| Sector | renewable_energy |
| Country | India |
| Vintage | Stale |
| Project Methodology | AMS I.D Version 11 |
| Crediting Period | 2008 — 2018 |
| VVB | TÜV NORD CERT GmbH |
| Monitoring Period | 2016 — 2018 |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 19 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-13 |

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring record, and the only contradiction suggests a later document treated it as negligible without clear supporting detail.
- The validation report recorded 8 corrective action requests and 7 clarification requests, indicating material documentation and implementation issues during validation.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project used a combined additionality test under CDM.

- Leakage justification is not addressed in the monitoring record, and no buffer pool or reversal handling is stated.

The validation report confirms additionality through a combined test and states that TÜV NORD CERT GmbH verified it, which supports the project's core integrity. However, the monitoring record does not address leakage, and no buffer pool, reversal event handling, or reassessment of the baseline is stated in the extracted record. The validation also reported 8 corrective action requests and 7 clarification requests, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the underlying project documentation.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has multiple source documents available, including validation, PDD, and monitoring records, with a named VVB.

- Verified versus claimed emission reductions are not stated, and key monitoring details such as usage monitoring are missing.

The record includes a named VVB, a monitoring period, a crediting period, and multiple document types, which helps transparency. At the same time, verified and claimed emission reduction totals are not stated, and usage monitoring details are missing. The extraction confidence is medium, so the documentation is usable but not especially strong.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is a wind energy CDM activity with a project-specific baseline and a grid emission factor stated in the documents.

- Leakage treatment is weak and contradictory, which raises over-crediting risk despite the later note that it was deemed negligible.

Claim safety is constrained by the weak leakage treatment and the absence of verified emission reduction figures in the extracted record. The project uses AMS I.D with a project baseline and a grid emission factor from 2006–2007, but the later contradiction says leakage was deemed negligible while the monitoring record says it was not addressed. I privileged the monitoring report's explicit statement because it is the more direct source for leakage treatment, while noting the contradiction lowers confidence.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ Nineteen documents were used, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- The validation report lists multiple corrective action requests and clarification requests, showing that the documentation was not clean or fully straightforward.

The evidence base is reasonably broad, with validation, PDD, monitoring, and other documents listed, and 19 documents were used in extraction. The extraction confidence is medium, not low, so there is no severe readability penalty. Still, the presence of many corrective actions and the lack of several key quantified fields mean the documentation is only moderately complete.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and reconcile the contradiction between the monitoring report and the later document.

→ Publish verified emission reduction totals and the full monitoring methodology, including how usage and grid factors were applied.

Documents Reviewed

- revised monitoring plan
- 01 Jul 2012 - 31 Aug 2014
- Malpani Annual Testing
- Malpani Accuracy Details
- approval
- Appendix 1 - IRR calculations-D J Malpani
- 24 Oct 2008 - 30 Jun 2010
- 01 Jul 2010 - 30 Sep 2011
- Malpani Callibration Declaration
- Appendix 2 - CER calculations-D J Malpani
- 01 Jul 2012 - 31 Mar 2016
- registration request form
- 01 Oct 2011 - 30 Jun 2012
- 01 Apr 2016 - 23 Oct 2018
- project design document
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- validation report of revised monitoring plan
- 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-4A06C7A7 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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