

QUALITY REPORT

Bundled Wind power project in Jaisalmer (Rajasthan in...

CNN-e79801 · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-6BBAC4AE · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8

Overall Score

out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected wind project using a recognized CDM methodology (ACM0002) with additionality confirmed by the VVB, and no material findings or corrective actions reported in the extracted record. However, key integrity elements are weakly evidenced in the available documents, especially leakage treatment and baseline reassessment timing, and there are notable internal inconsistencies (e.g., grid emission factor and additionality test type) that increase over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-e79801
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 4
Crediting Period	2004 — 2014
VVB	KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2006 — 2011
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report and no leakage deduction is stated, creating an evidence gap on a core accounting element.
- Contradictory grid emission factor values (0.90852 vs 908.52) across monitoring reports suggest a unit/decimal error risk that could materially affect credited reductions.
- Additionality test type is inconsistent across validation reports (barrier vs investment), reducing confidence in the additionality narrative.
- Safeguards appear inconsistently documented and FPIC/grievance mechanism are not evidenced in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the validation documentation.
- Leakage is not addressed and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record.

The validation documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, but the specific additionality test is inconsistent across validation reports (one cites a barrier test while another cites an investment test), which weakens robustness. The monitoring report (2011) does not address leakage, and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record, leaving an important integrity element unresolved. The baseline is described as project-specific, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the available documents, increasing the risk that baseline assumptions became outdated over the long crediting period.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with a defined monitoring period (2006-07-01 to 2011-08-31).
- Verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency and cross-checking.

The extracted record includes key document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and clearly states the monitoring period (2006-07-01 to 2011-08-31) and claimed ERs (374,562). However, the verified ER total is not found in the extracted record, preventing a direct claimed-versus-verified comparison. A major transparency concern is the internal inconsistency in the grid emission factor reported across monitoring reports, which makes it harder for third parties to reproduce calculations confidently.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, lowering aviation-claim channel risk.
- Contradictions in key quantification inputs (grid emission factor) and missing verified ER figures increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation claims. Still, over-crediting risk is elevated because a key quantification parameter (grid emission factor) appears with two incompatible magnitudes in monitoring documentation, consistent with a potential unit/decimal error. In addition, the absence of a verified ER figure in the extracted record and the lack of leakage treatment make it harder to substantiate conservative crediting to external claimants.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

- + Document coverage is relatively strong (11 documents used) and extraction confidence is high.
- Safeguards and stakeholder protection elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism) are not evidenced in the extracted record.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong, with 11 documents used and high extraction confidence, and the monitoring report (2011) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. However, safeguards are inconsistently evidenced: the monitoring report indicates safeguards are not mentioned, FPIC is not evidenced, and no grievance mechanism is evidenced in the extracted record. This reduces confidence that social safeguards were systematically documented and monitored over time.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project (no reversal pool needed)
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project-specific; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verification/issuance tables showing verified ERs for the monitoring period and reconcile claimed vs verified totals in a single public summary.

→ Clarify and correct the grid emission factor (units, source year, and calculation) and publish a reproducible calculation sheet to resolve the 0.90852 vs 908.52 discrepancy.

→ Add explicit leakage assessment (even if concluded negligible) with justification consistent with the methodology and monitoring report.

Documents Reviewed

- Appendix 2 - Revised ER spreadsheet
- approval
- registration request form
- Compilation of all comments received
- 01 Jan 2013 - 31 Aug 2013
- Appendix 3 - Original and revised IRR spreadsheets
- Explanation of taking due account of comments
- List of interviewed persons
- 01 Jul 2004 - 30 Jun 2006
- List of documents
- 01 Sep 2011 - 31 Dec 2012
- Wind power project in Jaisalmer (Rajasthan in India) managed by Enercon (India) Ltd.
- authorization
- 01 Jul 2006 - 31 Aug 2011
- Appendix 1 - Revised PDD Tracked
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- project design document

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-6BBAC4AE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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