QUALITY REPORT

Energy Efficiency measures in DMRC Phase II stations

GS-154 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-0D8DD238 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	7.1
	Transparency (25%)	5.4
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	Documentation (15%)	6.3

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

Assessment Summary

This is a reasonably documented energy-efficiency project with VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage treatment, and no material findings reported in the verification report. However, key transparency items are missing from the extracted record, and there is a crediting-period contradiction between the validation and verification reports that slightly weakens confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-154
Sector	industrial
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-II.E Version 10, CDM EB35
Crediting Period	2012 — 2021
VVB	The Gold Standard Foundation
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The crediting period differs between the validation report and the later verification report, which creates a reliability issue for the project timeline.
- Several core MRV and market-access fields are not stated in the extracted record, including total ERs claimed/verified, monitoring method, and CORSIA/CCP status.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 7.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under AMS-II.E.

- Reversal risk is not addressed in the extracted record, and no buffer pool percentage is stated.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and states that the VVB accepted it, which supports the project's core integrity case. Leakage is explicitly quantified at 0%, and the verification report reports no material findings or corrective actions required. On the weaker side, reversal risk is not addressed in the extracted record and no buffer pool is stated, which is a limitation even for an energy-efficiency project.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The project has multiple source documents in the evidence set, including a validation report, verification report, and monitoring report.

- Total ERs claimed and verified are not stated, and the monitoring method is not found in the extracted record.

The evidence set includes a validation report, verification report, monitoring report, and PDD, which is a positive sign for traceability. Still, the extracted record does not state total ERs claimed or verified, and the monitoring method is not found, limiting the ability to check MRV completeness. The registry is identified as Gold Standard, but the record does not provide enough public-facing accounting detail to score transparency higher.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ Leakage is treated with a quantified deduction of 0%, which is at least explicitly addressed.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and CORSIA/CCP status is not stated.

Claim safety is helped by the explicit leakage deduction of 0% and by the project's energy-efficiency nature, which generally has lower permanence risk than removal projects. However, the baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, and the baseline reassessment timing is only partially clear from the extracted record. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available documents.

Documentation — 6.3 / 10

+ The extraction confidence is high, and the verification report reports no material findings or corrective actions required.

- The record still lacks several important fields, and the crediting-period contradiction reduces confidence in document consistency.

Documentation quality is moderate to good because the extraction confidence is high and the verification report is dated later than the validation report, indicating a reasonably complete document trail. The verification report also reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. That said, several key fields remain unstated in the extracted record, and the crediting-period discrepancy between the validation report and verification report reduces documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
Leakage	0% quantified leakage deduction
Baseline	Project baseline; reassessment timing limited
Safeguards	Grievance mechanism present, FPIC not stated
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the monitoring methodology and the total ERs claimed and verified for the monitoring period.

→ Resolve the crediting-period discrepancy across validation and verification documents and disclose CORSIA/CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.01.2012 to 31.12.2013_v1.pdf
- GS1246.pdf
- GS1246 LSC Report Template_26.09.2012_v2.pdf
- PDD 07.03.2012_v1.pdf
- PDD 06.11.2013_v3.doc
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-154
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-154
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01.01.2012 to 31.12.2013_v2.1.pdf
- GS1246 Validation Report Template_v2.2.doc

Report ID: CM-0D8DD238 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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