

QUALITY REPORT

Wind power project by HIL at Gujarat, India

CNN-e2240e · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-F1781D70 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	1.5

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, key integrity and MRV elements (baseline approach, additionality demonstration, monitoring period, and verified emission reductions) are not available. With only one poorly readable/low-confidence source document and many missing fields, the project's credit quality cannot be substantiated from the provided evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-e2240e
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No baseline method, grid emission factor, or monitoring period found in the extracted record, preventing assessment of over-crediting risk
- Additionality test type and whether a VVB confirmed additionality are not stated in available documents
- Verified emission reductions are not available (no verified ERR figure found)
- Low extraction confidence and only one document used, indicating high documentation and data reliability risk

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.2 / 10

- Baseline approach, leakage treatment, and additionality evidence were not found in the extracted record (source document listed as unknown)

~ No material findings or corrective actions are recorded, but this is weak evidence given the low-confidence extraction (unknown document)

The extracted record does not include the baseline method, methodology, grid emission factor, or any baseline reassessment timing, so baseline validity cannot be evaluated (source document listed as unknown). Additionality is also not evidenced: neither the additionality test type nor confirmation by the VVB is stated in available documents (unknown document). Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no deduction or justification found), and permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool) are not applicable/assessable from the available data for this avoidance project (unknown document).

Transparency — 0.8 / 10

- Core MRV fields (VVB name, monitoring period, claimed vs verified ERR) are not stated in available documents (unknown document)

- Registry eligibility fields (CORSIA/CCP) are not found in the extracted record, limiting traceability for buyers (unknown document)

Transparency is weak because the VVB name, monitoring period, and both claimed and verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record (unknown document). While the registry is identified as Gold Standard, the documentation does not provide enough MRV detail to independently check calculations or issuance alignment (unknown document). Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that missing items are truly absent rather than unreadable.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method and grid emission factor are not available in the extracted record (unknown document)

~ Double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be evaluated because CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents (unknown document)

Claim safety is limited by the absence of key quantification inputs: baseline method and grid emission factor are not stated in available documents, preventing a reasonableness check on avoided emissions (unknown document). CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not found in the extracted record, increasing the risk that buyers could make claims without clear eligibility context (unknown document). With no verified ERR figure available, the risk of overstated claims cannot be screened.

Documentation — 1.5 / 10

- Only one evidence document is listed and it is labeled unknown, with low extraction confidence

- No document date, methodology/version, or crediting/monitoring period details were found in the extracted record

Documentation quality is very low: only one evidence document is listed and it is labeled as unknown, with low extraction confidence, suggesting the underlying source was poorly readable or incomplete. No document date, project name, methodology/version, or crediting/monitoring period details were found in the extracted record, which prevents basic due diligence checks. The absence of any identified verification/monitoring report metadata (e.g., VVB name) further undermines reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality evidence not found
● Permanence	Avoidance project; permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance/safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the Gold Standard PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports (with dates, monitoring period, VVB name, and claimed vs verified ERs) to substantiate MRV and issuance

→ Disclose the applied methodology and baseline/grid emission factor inputs (including the EF vintage and any reassessment) plus leakage assessment/justification and stakeholder consultation evidence (FPIC/grievance mechanism)

Documents Reviewed

- Gold Standard Registry — GS-6491

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-F1781D70 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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