QUALITY REPORT

1.65 MW Wind Power Project by G. R. Engineering Pvt. Ltd.

CDM-9177 · CDM · India

Report ID: CM-BFF60B7E · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	7.0
Transparency (25%)	4.8
Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a small wind project with a reasonably strong additionality signal because the VVB confirmed an investment test and found no material findings. However, transparency is limited by missing monitoring-period and emissions data, and there is a contradiction on leakage treatment between the validation report and the PDD that reduces confidence somewhat.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-9177
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS I.D 17
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the validation report says leakage was deemed negligible, while the PDD indicates it was quantified.

■ Key MRV fields such as the monitoring period, claimed versus verified emission reductions, and usage monitoring details were not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 7.0 / 10

+ The validation report from Bureau Veritas Certification confirms additionality through an investment test, and no material findings were reported.

- Leakage treatment is not fully consistent across documents, and reversal risk is not addressed beyond the project being a wind project.

The validation report by Bureau Veritas Certification confirms additionality using an investment test, and it reports no material findings or corrective actions required. The project is a wind power activity under AMS I.D, which supports a relatively robust baseline framework, but leakage handling is not fully clean because the validation report says leakage was deemed negligible while the PDD indicates it was quantified. No buffer pool or reversal-event treatment was found, so permanence is only moderately supported.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is documented under the CDM with a named VVB and a validation report dated 2012-12-22.

- The monitoring period, verified emissions, and usage monitoring method were not stated in the available documents, limiting MRV transparency.

The documentation identifies the VVB and the CDM registry, but core MRV details are missing from the extracted record. The monitoring period, total claimed versus verified emission reductions, and usage monitoring method were not found, which weakens public traceability and makes it hard to assess performance over time. Extraction confidence was medium, so this is not a severe readability problem, but it still leaves important gaps.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project uses AMS I.D for a wind activity, which is generally a standardized renewable-energy baseline approach.

- The leakage contradiction and missing emissions figures leave some over-crediting risk unresolved, even though the project is marked CORSIA-eligible.

Claim safety is helped by the standardized wind methodology and by the VVB-confirmed additionality finding. Still, the contradiction on leakage treatment creates uncertainty about how conservatively the project was credited, and the absence of verified emissions totals prevents a direct check for over-crediting. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which does not by itself create a problem, but it also means dual-channel claim risk is not eliminated on the available facts.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

+ Multiple evidence documents were used, including a validation report and PDD, and extraction confidence was medium rather than low.

- Several important fields were not found in the extracted record, including the crediting period, monitoring period, and any quantified emission reduction totals.

The record includes a validation report, a PDD, and other extracted material, so the project is not documentation-poor. Even so, several key fields are missing, including the crediting period, monitoring period, and emissions totals, and the extraction confidence is only medium. There are no corrective actions reported, which is positive, but the overall documentation remains incomplete for a full-quality assessment.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No buffer or reversal treatment stated
Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible status without CCP status

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring report with verified emission reductions, monitoring period, and usage monitoring details.

→ Resolve the leakage discrepancy between the validation report and the PDD, and document any conservative deduction applied.

Documents Reviewed

- approval
- registration request form
- Appendix 2 - IRR.xls
- Appendix 1 - ER sheet.xls
- project design document
- Validation report

Report ID: CM-BFF60B7E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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