QUALITY REPORT

# Upgradation, Operation and Maintenance of 200 TPD Comp…

CNN-6b377c · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-F8261597 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

| | |
|---|---|
| **1.7** Overall Score out of 10 | |
| **Integrity (35%)** | **2.2** |
| **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 carbon-accounting elements (baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, and monitoring details) are not available, making it difficult to judge whether credits are conservatively quantified. With only one poorly readable/low-confidence source document, the project's evidentiary basis is too thin to support high confidence in credit quality.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| **Registry** | Gold Standard |
| **Registry ID** | CNN-6b377c |
| **Sector** | industrial |
| **Country** | India |
| **Vintage** | 2013 |
| **Confidence** | Medium |
| **Documents Reviewed** | 1 document reviewed |
| **Scored** | 2026-04-02 |

## Red Flags

- ■ Baseline approach and reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, creating high over-crediting risk.
- ■ Additionality test and whether it was confirmed by the VVB were not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Leakage deduction and justification were not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Monitoring period, verified ERs, and MRV details were not found in the extracted record; only one low-confidence document was used.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.2 / 10

- Baseline method, additionality demonstration, and leakage treatment 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 and unknown document type.

The extracted record does not include the baseline approach, additionality test, or leakage treatment, so the core integrity checks cannot be performed (source document listed as unknown). Buffer pool and reversal information are also not found, though this is an avoidance project where reversal risk may be lower; the absence of any permanence-related documentation still reduces confidence. No material findings or corrective actions are recorded, but given the low-confidence extraction and unknown document type, this does not strongly support integrity.

### Transparency — 0.8 / 10

- Monitoring period, VVB name, and verified ERs were not found in the extracted record (source document listed as unknown).
- Only one document was used and it was poorly readable (low extraction confidence), limiting auditability.

Transparency is weak because the VVB name, monitoring period, and verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record (source document listed as unknown). MRV elements such as usage monitoring method and key parameters are also not available. With only one low-confidence document, the project is not readily auditable from the extracted evidence.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Claimed vs verified ERs and key parameters (e.g., grid factor/FNRB where relevant) were not found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be screened.

Claim safety is limited because neither claimed nor verified ER totals are available, preventing a check for over-issuance risk (source document listed as unknown). Eligibility signals that often affect claims (CORSIA eligibility and CCP status) are not found in the extracted record, so potential double-claim/market-eligibility risks cannot be screened. Missing baseline and leakage information further elevates the risk that credited reductions could be overstated.

### Documentation — 1.5 / 10

- Evidence base is minimal (one document) and the document type/date are unknown (source document listed as unknown).
- Extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable.

Documentation quality is very low: only one evidence document is listed and it is labeled as unknown, with no document date provided (source document listed as unknown). The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability and increasing the chance that key details were missed or mis-extracted. The absence of standard fields typically present in PDD/monitoring/verification reports suggests the available documentation set is incomplete.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| **Additionality** | Additionality not evidenced in extracted record |
| **Permanence** | Avoidance type, but permanence provisions not evidenced |
| **Leakage** | Leakage treatment not evidenced |
| **Baseline** | Baseline method not evidenced |
| **Safeguards** | FPIC/grievance/safeguards not evidenced |
| **Double-claim** | CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports (with dates), including the baseline methodology, additionality demonstration, leakage assessment, and monitoring period details.

→ Disclose registry/issuance data and verification outputs (VVB name, claimed vs verified ERs, any findings/corrective actions) and clarify CORSIA eligibility and CCP status to reduce claim and double-claim risk.

## Documents Reviewed

• Gold Standard Registry — GS-2470



Report ID: CM-F8261597 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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