QUALITY REPORT

1.5 MW Grid connected Wind Electricity Generation at Tirunelveli District, Tamilnadu, India by Kallam Agro Products and Oils Private Limited

CDM-2770 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-89BB5D6E · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.1
Transparency (25%)	4.2
Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a CDM wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality, but the record shows substantial validation effort and several evidence gaps. Leakage treatment is weakly documented, reversal risk is not addressed, and the project relies on a project baseline rather than a more robust standardized baseline, which limits confidence in the crediting claim.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-2770
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D. 13
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2011
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

■ The validation report recorded 22 corrective action requests and 7 clarification requests, indicating significant issues during validation.

■ Leakage justification is not addressed in the validation report, and reversal risk is also not addressed.

■ There is a contradiction on the crediting period between documents, and the later PDD appears to use a different start and end date.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.1 / 10

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

- Leakage is not addressed in the validation report, and reversal events are not addressed.

The validation report from Bureau Veritas Certification confirms additionality through a combined test, which supports the project's core eligibility. However, the same report leaves leakage justification not addressed and does not address reversal events, while the project uses a project baseline and was subject to 22 corrective action requests and 7 clarification requests, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the crediting logic.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

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

- No verified or claimed emission reduction totals are available in the extracted record, and key MRV details such as grid factor and usage monitoring are not stated.

The record identifies the VVB and provides a monitoring period, but several key MRV fields are missing from the extracted documents, including verified emission reduction totals, grid emission factor, and usage monitoring details. The documentation is therefore only partially transparent, with important quantitative elements not found in the available record.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is a wind electricity project under CDM, which generally reduces some baseline and leakage complexity compared with land-use projects.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, leakage is left unjustified, and there is no evidence of CCP status or CORSIA ineligibility to reduce dual-claim risk.

Claim safety is limited by the project-specific baseline and the absence of a clear leakage rationale in the validation report. The project is a wind CDM activity, which is generally lower risk than many land-use projects, but there is no evidence in the extracted record that it is excluded from CORSIA or CCP pathways, so dual-claim risk cannot be discounted.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including a validation report and PDD, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- The validation report lists 22 corrective action requests, and the record contains a date contradiction on the crediting period.

The evidence base includes multiple official documents, but the extracted record shows only medium extraction confidence and a large number of corrective actions in validation. The crediting period also conflicts across documents, and the later PDD date appears to differ from the validation report, so the documentation is incomplete and somewhat inconsistent.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
Leakage	0% deduction without justification
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment dated 2006
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full validation and monitoring evidence for emission reductions, grid factor, and leakage treatment, including the basis for any zero leakage deduction.

→ Resolve the crediting-period inconsistency and publish a clear statement on reversal risk, registry status, and whether the project is eligible for or excluded from other crediting channels.

Documents Reviewed

- 15 Dec 2009 - 20 Dec 2011
- registration request form
- approval
- project design document
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- Validation report

Report ID: CM-89BB5D6E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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