

QUALITY REPORT

# Water filter project in Dindori, Madhya Pradesh, India

GS-4212 · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-766ACE37 · Generated: 2026-04-11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

## Assessment Summary

This is a certified Gold Standard water-filter project with VVB-confirmed additionality, no reported reversals, and strong usage evidence from an annual survey showing 100% verified use. However, key baseline and leakage details are not stated, and the record shows multiple corrective requests plus low extraction confidence, which weakens trust in the documentation.

## Project Details

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Registry            | Gold Standard   |
| Registry ID         | GS-4212   |
| Sector              | water   |
| Country             | India   |
| Vintage             | 2023  |
| Project Methodology | Methodology for Emission Reductions From Safe Drinking Water Supply 1.0 |
| Crediting Period    | 2023 — 2028   |
| VVB                 | LGAI Technological Center, S.A.   |
| Verified ERs        | 3,155 tCO <sub>2</sub> e  |
| Monitoring Period   | 2024 — 2024   |
| Confidence          | Medium  |
| Documents Reviewed  | 8 documents reviewed  |
| Scored              | 2026-04-11  |

## Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is not addressed, with no quantified deduction or justification found in the extracted documents.
- The verification record required 07 corrective action requests and 04 clarification requests, and the extraction confidence is low.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project is an avoidance-type water filter activity with no reversal events reported.

- Baseline method, leakage deduction, and buffer pool coverage are not stated in the available documents.

The project benefits from VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported reversal events, which supports the core environmental integrity case. It is also an avoidance project, so permanence risk is inherently lower than for removals. That said, the baseline method is not stated, leakage is marked as not addressed, and no buffer pool percentage is available, all of which reduce confidence in the robustness of the crediting logic.

### Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the VVB is named as LGAI Technological Center, S.A.

- Total verified ERs are reported, but claimed ERs are not available for comparison, and the extraction confidence is low.

The monitoring period is clearly identified as 2024-02-01 to 2024-12-31, and the VVB is named in the extracted record. Verified emissions reductions are reported at 3,155, but the claimed amount is not available for reconciliation. The low extraction confidence further weakens transparency because at least one key source was poorly readable.

### Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The verified usage rate is 100%, supported by an annual survey, and the FNRB value of 89.2 was derived from local field data.

- Leakage is not addressed, and the absence of a stated baseline method increases over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is helped by the verified 100% usage rate and the annual survey method, which suggest the intervention was actually used. The FNRB value of 89.2 was derived from local field data, which is preferable to a generic default. However, leakage is not addressed and the baseline method is missing, so the risk of over-crediting cannot be ruled out confidently.

### Documentation — 3.8 / 10

+ The record includes multiple official-document fields, a named VVB, and a defined crediting period and monitoring period.

- Low extraction confidence, several corrective requests, and missing baseline/leakage specifics indicate incomplete documentation.

The record draws on eight documents and includes a named verifier, a crediting period, and a monitoring period, which is a positive sign. Even so, the extraction confidence is low, and the verification process still required 07 corrective action requests and 04 clarification requests. Important technical details such as the baseline method and leakage treatment are not stated in the available documents.

## Risk Indicators

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| ● <b>Additionality</b> | VVB-confirmed additionality              |
| ● <b>Permanence</b>    | Avoidance project; no reversals reported |
| ● <b>Leakage</b>       | Leakage not addressed                    |
| ● <b>Baseline</b>      | Baseline method not stated               |
| ● <b>Safeguards</b>    | FPIC and grievance mechanism present     |
| ● <b>Double-claim</b>  | CORSIA/CCP status not stated             |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the baseline methodology, including any reassessment timing and the rationale for the chosen baseline.

→ Provide a quantified leakage assessment and a complete reconciliation of claimed versus verified emission reductions in the monitoring package.

## Documents Reviewed

- Project-Annual-Report\_GSGS12220\_29122025.pdf
- Stake holder consultation report\_v02.pdf
- GS 12220\_VPA DD\_v4.0\_CL.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4212
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4212
- GS 12220\_FVeR\_CL.pdf
- GS 12220\_FVeR.pdf
- GS 12220\_VPA\_FVaR\_CL.pdf

### 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-766ACE37 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-11 · Generated: 2026-04-11

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)