

QUALITY REPORT

20 MW Enercon Wind farms (SAI) Pvt. Limited in Maharas...

CNN-a210e5 · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-3F38FCFC · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected wind project using a standard CDM methodology with additionality confirmed by the VVB, which supports basic environmental integrity. However, leakage is not addressed, safeguards/FPIC and grievance processes are absent in the extracted record, and there are major inconsistencies in claimed and verified emission reductions across monitoring reports that increase over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-a210e5
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Project Methodology	ACM0002 11
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	62,422 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large contradictions in both claimed and verified emission reductions across monitoring reports (e.g., verified 62,422 vs 102,778; claimed 131,839 vs 25,011), undermining confidence in credit quantities
- Leakage is explicitly not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record
- Safeguards are weakly documented: FPIC not conducted and no grievance mechanism found in the extracted record

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Leakage is not addressed and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents, weakening confidence in the baseline and net impact.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the VVB confirmed additionality using an investment test (validation/verification record as reflected in the extracted facts). The baseline is project-specific under ACM0002 (v11), but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which is a weakness for a long crediting period. Leakage is explicitly not addressed in the extracted record and no leakage deduction is stated, which reduces confidence that net ERs are conservatively estimated.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

- + A named VVB (Earthood Services Private Limited) and a defined monitoring period (2017-03-01 to 2020-12-13) are provided in the monitoring report (2022).

- Major inconsistencies in claimed and verified ER figures across monitoring reports reduce MRV clarity and comparability.

The monitoring report (2022-08-30) provides a clear monitoring period (2017-03-01 to 2020-12-13) and identifies the VVB as Earthood Services Private Limited. However, transparency is undermined by inconsistent ER totals across monitoring reports, making it difficult to reconcile what was claimed versus what was verified over time. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, limiting clarity for downstream buyers.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project uses a widely applied CDM grid methodology (ACM0002 v11) with a stated grid emission factor (0.90641).
- Over-crediting risk is elevated due to contradictory claimed/verified ER totals and missing leakage treatment; CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in available documents.

Because this is an avoidance renewable electricity project using ACM0002 with a stated grid emission factor (0.90641), the core quantification approach is recognizable and auditable in principle. Nonetheless, the large contradictions in both claimed and verified ER totals across monitoring reports materially increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk. In addition, leakage is not addressed and no deduction is evidenced, and eligibility signals (CORSIA/CCP) are not stated in available documents, which increases uncertainty for claims.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

- + Extraction confidence is high and multiple documents were used (7), including monitoring and validation reports.
- Key governance/safeguard elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are not evidenced in the extracted record.

The extracted record draws on multiple documents (7) with high extraction confidence, supporting a moderate documentation score. Still, key non-carbon documentation elements are missing in the extracted record: FPIC is stated as not conducted, and safeguards, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are not evidenced. The crediting period is long and appears inconsistently stated across documents, which also points to documentation control issues.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed; no deduction stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled ER table across all monitoring periods showing claimed vs verified ERs, with references to each monitoring/verification report and registry issuance records to resolve contradictions.

→ Document and implement social safeguards: stakeholder engagement evidence, FPIC where applicable, a grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing arrangements, and include these in publicly available reports.

Documents Reviewed

- 01 Aug 2011 - 31 Mar 2012
- 01 Apr 2012 - 31 Dec 2012
- approval
- 14 Dec 2010 - 31 Jul 2011
- 01 Mar 2017 - 13 Dec 2020
- 01 Jan 2013 - 28 Feb 2017
- registration request form
- project design document
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- 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-3F38FCFC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy