

QUALITY REPORT

15 MW grid-connected wind power project by MMTTC in Karnataka

CDM-1797 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-97D5D1F7 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a CDM wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported, which supports basic integrity. However, several key items are either not stated or inconsistent across documents, including leakage treatment, crediting period timing, and the absence of verified emission reduction totals, which weakens confidence in the claim.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1797
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS ID 11
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Leakage is inconsistently described: the PDD says it is negligible, while the validation report says it is not addressed.
- The crediting period differs between documents, and the record also lacks verified emission reduction totals and a public usage-monitoring method.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + The validation report confirms additionality through a combined test, and the VVB is named as TÜV NORD CERT GmbH.
- Leakage treatment is disputed across documents, and reversal risk is not addressed beyond a wind project context.

The validation report confirms additionality using a combined test, and the VVB is identified as TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, which supports the core project case. No material findings or corrective actions were reported in the extracted record. Still, leakage is not consistently handled: the PDD describes it as negligible, while the validation report says it was not addressed, so I discount the score for reliability.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The monitoring report identifies the monitoring period and the registry is CDM, which gives some traceability.
- Verified and claimed emission reduction totals are not stated in the extracted record, and the usage-monitoring method is not found.

The monitoring report provides a monitoring period from 2016-01-01 to 2017-12-31, and the project is clearly tied to the CDM registry. However, the extracted record does not state verified or claimed emission reduction totals, and the usage-monitoring method is not found. That leaves the MRV trail incomplete for external review.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + The project is a wind power activity under CDM, which generally lowers baseline and fuel-switching ambiguity compared with many other project types.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, leakage justification is contested, and CORSIA eligibility is true, which keeps dual-claim risk from being low.

This is a wind project, so the baseline risk is lower than for many fuel-based activities, but the baseline method is project-specific rather than a more standardized jurisdictional approach. The leakage justification is contradictory across documents, which raises over-crediting concern. CORSIA eligibility is true, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-market claim risk is not eliminated.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

- + Multiple official document types were used, including validation, PDD, and monitoring material, and no corrective actions were required.
- One extracted document is poorly characterized, extraction confidence is only medium, and the record does not clearly show a recent reassessment of the crediting setup.

The record draws on multiple official sources, including validation, PDD, and monitoring documents, and the VVB is named. FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are all mentioned, which helps the documentation picture. Even so, extraction confidence is only medium, one document is poorly characterized, and the crediting period is inconsistent across documents, reducing documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No reversal events, but no buffer detail
● Leakage	Leakage treatment disputed
● 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 reconciled, document-controlled explanation for the leakage treatment and crediting period discrepancy, with the latest authoritative source clearly identified.

→ Publish verified emission reduction totals and the usage-monitoring method, along with clearer registry and eligibility information to reduce claim-risk uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

- revised monitoring plan
- approval
- Appendix 1 - MMTC_IRRwoCDM
- Appendix 3 - MMTC_CER
- 20 Feb 2009 - 31 Mar 2010
- 01 Apr 2010 - 31 Dec 2015
- registration request form
- 01 Jan 2016 - 31 Dec 2017
- Appendix 2 - MMTC_IRRwoCDM
- project design document
- 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-97D5D1F7 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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