

QUALITY REPORT

29.7 MW Wind Power project in Karnataka, India

CDM-1949 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-BADED2F1 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

This wind project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, the record also shows multiple corrective actions, no stated leakage treatment in the validation report, and missing key monitoring details, which weakens confidence in the crediting claims.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1949
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM 0002 6
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	DET NORSKE VERITAS CERTIFICATION AS
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2011
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- The validation report lists seven corrective actions, indicating material documentation or methodology issues at validation.
- Leakage is not addressed in the validation report, and the later document suggesting it was negligible is contradicted by the earlier source.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the validation report indicates a combined additionality test rather than no test at all.

- The validation report records seven corrective actions, and leakage is not addressed there; the later claim of negligible leakage conflicts with the earlier document.

The validation report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB verified it, which supports the project's core crediting case. That said, the same report lists seven corrective actions, and leakage is not addressed there, so the integrity picture is weakened by unresolved methodological and reporting gaps. The later contradiction on leakage was not privileged over the validation report because the validation report is the primary approval document and is more directly relevant to project design claims.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period for 2011, and a clear CDM registry context.

- Total ERs claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record, and the monitoring approach for usage and leakage is not stated.

Transparency is moderate because the record identifies the VVB, the registry, and a specific 2011 monitoring period. But the extracted facts do not include claimed versus verified ER totals, nor do they state the usage monitoring method or any quantified leakage treatment. The absence of these details limits the ability to independently trace the issuance claim.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline under ACM 0002, which is at least a recognized CDM methodology framework.

- Leakage treatment is unclear, and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, leaving dual-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is constrained by the project-specific baseline and the lack of a stated leakage deduction. The record also does not state whether the project is CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available documents. Because the later document says leakage was negligible while the validation report says it was not addressed, I give priority to the validation report and discount the claim-safety score.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ The extraction draws on 12 documents, and the VVB is identified as Det Norske Veritas Certification AS.

- The minimum extraction confidence is only medium, and the validation report is dated 2008 while the monitoring period is 2011, so the evidence set is incomplete and partly dated.

The evidence base includes multiple documents and identifies the VVB, which is helpful. However, the minimum extraction confidence is only medium, and several key fields are missing or not stated, including buffer pool treatment, leakage quantification, and issuance totals. The validation report is also relatively old compared with the monitoring period, which reduces documentation completeness for assessing the credited period.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed in validation
● 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 the monitoring report or issuance record showing claimed versus verified ER totals, leakage treatment, and any post-validation updates.

→ Document a clear baseline reassessment history and explicit statements on CORSIA eligibility and CCP status to reduce dual-claim uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

- Appendix 4 - Addendum to Cert approval
- Appendix 3 - annex2 registration request form
- 01 Jan 2010 - 31 Dec 2010 authorization
- 01 Jan 2011 - 31 Dec 2011
- 01 Aug 2009 - 31 Dec 2009
- 20 Nov 2008 - 31 Jul 2009
- Appendix 5 - B&R
- 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-BADED2F1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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