

## QUALITY REPORT

# Grid Connected Wind Power Project by M/s. D. J. Malpan...

CNN-4849e7 · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-BFF64844 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.6**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected wind project using a standard small-scale methodology (AMS-I.D.) with additionality confirmed by the VVB, which supports baseline credibility. However, key elements are weak or inconsistent across monitoring reports, including leakage treatment and large discrepancies between claimed and verified emission reductions, increasing over-crediting and data-reliability concerns. Social safeguards (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are not evidenced in the extracted record.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-4849e7
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. 16
Crediting Period	2012 — 2019
VVB	Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Limited
Verified ERs	29,192 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions in the 2017 monitoring report (34,109 claimed vs 29,192 verified), indicating over-crediting risk and/or MRV weaknesses.
- Contradictory monitoring-report figures for both claimed and verified ERs across periods/documents, reducing confidence in reported outcomes.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports (one says not addressed; another says deemed negligible), with no quantified deduction found.
- Safeguards appear absent in the extracted record (no FPIC, no grievance mechanism, no benefit sharing described).

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Leakage is inconsistently treated across monitoring reports and no leakage deduction is evidenced in the extracted record.

Additionality appears reasonably supported: the validation/verification record indicates the VVB confirmed additionality using an investment test. The baseline approach is project-specific under AMS-I.D., and the grid emission factor is stated (0.9487 for 2011), but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not found in the extracted record. Leakage is a key weakness: the 2017 monitoring report indicates leakage was not addressed, while an earlier monitoring report (2014) describes leakage as deemed negligible, and no leakage deduction is evidenced.

### Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + A named VVB (Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Limited) and a defined monitoring period (2014-04-01 to 2016-09-30) are provided in the monitoring report (2017).

- Claimed vs verified ERs differ materially and also conflict with an earlier monitoring report, undermining MRV transparency.

The monitoring period is clearly stated in the monitoring report dated 2017-02-16 (2014-04-01 to 2016-09-30), and the VVB is identified as Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Limited. However, the monitoring report shows a sizable difference between claimed and verified ERs (34,109 claimed vs 29,192 verified), and earlier monitoring documentation reports different totals, which reduces transparency and confidence in the MRV trail. No usage monitoring method is applicable/available for this grid electricity project in the extracted record, but core ER accounting inconsistencies remain the main transparency issue.

### Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing some downstream double-claiming/eligibility confusion.
- Over-crediting risk is elevated due to large claimed-versus-verified differences and contradictory ER figures across monitoring reports.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of CORSIA-related claim misuse, though CCP status is not found in the extracted record. Over-crediting/greenwashing risk is elevated because the 2017 monitoring report shows a material reduction from claimed to verified ERs, and both claimed and verified totals conflict with an earlier monitoring report (2014). Leakage treatment inconsistency (not addressed vs deemed negligible) further increases the risk that credited reductions are overstated or insufficiently justified.

### Documentation — 6.8 / 10

- + Multiple document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, financial) and extraction confidence is high.
- Some key quality elements are missing from the extracted record (baseline reassessment timing, leakage deduction, safeguards evidence).

The extracted record includes multiple supporting documents (PDD, financial, validation report, monitoring report) with six documents used and high extraction confidence, which supports a solid documentation score. At the same time, several important items are not evidenced in the extracted record: baseline reassessment date, any leakage deduction percentage, buffer/pooling (not applicable for avoidance but still relevant to completeness), and safeguards documentation (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing). No material findings or corrective actions are reported, which is positive, but the missing/contradictory content limits completeness.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project; no reversal risk evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Inconsistent/insufficient leakage justification
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	No FPIC/grievance/benefit sharing evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not found

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, consistent leakage assessment in the monitoring/verification documentation (including whether leakage is negligible and why, and any applicable deduction).

→ Publish a reconciliation table across monitoring periods showing claimed vs verified ERs and explaining the differences between the 2014 and 2017 monitoring-report totals.

→ Document social safeguards: evidence of stakeholder consultation/FPIC where applicable, a functioning grievance mechanism, and any benefit-sharing arrangements.

## Documents Reviewed

- 01 Mar 2012 - 31 Mar 2014
- Appendix 1 - 02\_ER Sheet\_v2.2
- 01 Apr 2014 - 30 Sep 2016
- registration request form
- Appendix 2 - 03\_Financial\_Sheet\_V2.2
- approval
- project design document
- 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-BFF64844 · 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)