QUALITY REPORT

1.5 MW Wind Power Plant of Zenith Silk Mills at Kosha Village, in Kutch district of Gujarat state, India

CDM-8230 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-365AC62F · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	6.8
Transparency (25%)	5.4
Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a conventional wind CDM project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a project baseline, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record is incomplete on permanence, monitoring detail, and crediting-period specifics, and the validation report noted multiple corrective and clarification requests, which limits confidence in the documentation and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-8230
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.D 17
Crediting Period	null
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

■ The validation report recorded 6 corrective action requests and 11 clarification requests, indicating material issues during validation.

■ Key monitoring and permanence details are missing or not stated, including buffer pool coverage, reversal treatment, and usage monitoring.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the validation report.

- Permanence and leakage evidence are thin: reversal events are not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not found, and leakage is only described as negligible with a 0% deduction.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test and says the project was validated by Bureau Veritas Certification, which is a positive sign for core project integrity. At the same time, the record does not state a buffer pool, does not address reversal events, and only says leakage is deemed negligible with a 0% deduction, so permanence and leakage controls are only moderately supported. The multiple corrective and clarification requests in validation also suggest some weaknesses in the original project documentation.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, Bureau Veritas Certification, and a defined monitoring period from 2012-11-15 to 2020-12-31.

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

Transparency is mixed because the monitoring period is clearly stated and the VVB is identified, but the extracted record does not provide total ERs claimed or verified. The usage monitoring method is also not stated, and several operational fields are missing from the available documents. That leaves the MRV trail only partially reconstructable from the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project uses AMS I.D with a project baseline and a grid emission factor reported in the validation record.

- CORSIA eligibility is marked true, which keeps dual-claim risk open, and there is no CCP status to narrow that risk.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a standard CDM wind methodology and a project baseline, which is typical for this type of activity. However, the project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-claim risk is not fully resolved. Leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction, but the supporting justification is brief rather than detailed.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ The record draws from multiple evidence documents, including the validation report and PDD, with medium extraction confidence.

- The validation report itself noted 6 corrective action requests and 11 clarification requests, and the crediting period is not stated.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. The extracted record references seven documents and includes both the validation report and PDD, but extraction confidence is only medium and the validation report itself recorded 6 corrective action requests and 11 clarification requests. The crediting period is not stated, which weakens recency and completeness assessment.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
Leakage	0% deduction with limited justification
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verified emission reduction totals, monitoring methodology, and any registry issuance history for the full monitoring period.

→ Disclose permanence and leakage controls more fully, including buffer treatment, reversal provisions, and a clearer justification for the 0% leakage deduction.

Documents Reviewed

- approval
- registration request form
- 15 Nov 2012 - 31 Dec 2020
- Appendix 1 - ER_sheet
- Appendix 2 - IRR
- project design document
- Validation report

Report ID: CM-365AC62F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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