

## QUALITY REPORT

# Delta 3 Wind Power Plant

CM-516b4d · CDM Standard · Brazil

Report ID: CM-A4AA1576 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 5.6

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

## Assessment Summary

This CDM wind project shows moderate integrity: additionality is confirmed by the VVB and no material findings or corrective actions are reported. However, key baseline and leakage elements are not evidenced in the extracted record, and safeguards information is inconsistent across documents, increasing over-crediting and reputational risk.

## Project Details

Registry	CDM Standard
Registry ID	CM-516b4d
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2017
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.3.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2047
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Verified ERs	1,386,386 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions (1,917,737 claimed vs 1,386,386 verified) without an explained reason in the extracted record
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, despite being a required consideration under methodology application
- Safeguards information is contradictory between the monitoring report and the PDD

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Baseline and leakage substantiation are weak in the extracted record (project-specific baseline with no reassessment date found; leakage not addressed and no deduction stated).

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by Bureau Veritas Certification using an investment test. The monitoring report (2022-01-15) reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports procedural robustness. However, the baseline is project-specific (ACM0002) and the extracted record does not provide a baseline reassessment date or key grid emission factor details, and leakage is explicitly not addressed with no deduction stated in the monitoring report.

### Transparency — 6.1 / 10

- + Core MRV elements are present (named VVB, monitoring period 2016–2020, and a verified ER total reported).
- The extracted record lacks key quantification inputs (grid emission factor year/value not found) and does not explain the large claimed-versus-verified ER difference.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring report (2022-01-15) clearly states the monitoring period (2016-01-01 to 2020-12-31), the VVB name, and the verified ER total (1,386,386). At the same time, important calculation inputs (grid emission factor value/year) are not found in the extracted record, limiting reproducibility. The extracted record also does not provide an explanation for the difference between claimed and verified ERs.

### Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- Over-crediting risk signaled by the large reduction from claimed to verified ERs (about 28% lower verified than claimed).
- ~ CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, leaving downstream claim/eligibility risk unclear.

Claim safety is weakened by the sizable discrepancy between claimed and verified ERs (1,917,737 claimed vs 1,386,386 verified in the monitoring report), which increases perceived over-crediting/quality risk unless transparently explained. Leakage treatment is a further concern because the monitoring report indicates leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess eligibility-related claim constraints.

### Documentation — 7.2 / 10

- + Multiple official documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.
- Internal inconsistency on safeguards (PDD mentions safeguards while the monitoring report does not) reduces reliability.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: three key document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report is dated 2022-01-15 and covers 2016–2020, which is reasonably recent for MRV. However, the safeguards narrative is inconsistent across documents, which reduces confidence in completeness and internal consistency.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed; no deduction stated
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	No FPIC/grievance; safeguards inconsistent
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear reconciliation explaining why verified ERs are materially lower than claimed ERs, including which parameters or data sources changed during verification.

→ Disclose baseline calculation inputs (grid emission factor value and applicable year) and explicitly document leakage assessment and any resulting deduction (or a justified negligible-leakage conclusion).

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification 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-A4AA1576 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)