

## QUALITY REPORT

# Installation of Low Green House Gases (GHG) emitting rolling stock cars in metro

GS-820 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-2A341E55 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.6**Overall Score  
out of 10

|                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| ■ Integrity (35%)     | 6.1 |
| ■ Transparency (25%)  | 5.4 |
| ■ Claim Safety (25%)  | 5.6 |
| ■ Documentation (15%) | 5.0 |

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a named verifier, and no reported equipment exchange during the monitoring period. However, the record has important evidence gaps around baseline reassessment, leakage justification, and usage monitoring, and the verification report shows multiple closed corrective actions and clarifications, which reduces confidence. Overall, this looks like a moderately credible project with notable documentation and transparency weaknesses rather than a high-confidence issuance case.

## Project Details

|                     |                            |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Registry            | Gold Standard              |
| Registry ID         | GS-820                     |
| Sector              | industrial                 |
| Country             | India                      |
| Vintage             | Stale                      |
| Project Methodology | AMS III.C. 10              |
| Crediting Period    | null                       |
| VVB                 | TÜV NORD CERT GmbH         |
| Verified ERs        | 226,516 tCO <sub>2</sub> e |
| Monitoring Period   | 2013 — 2017                |
| Confidence          | Medium                     |
| Documents Reviewed  | 12 documents reviewed      |
| Scored              | 2026-04-18                 |

## Red Flags

- Leakage is not well explained: one part of the record says it was deemed negligible, but the verification report also leaves the justification not addressed.
- Several key MRV details are missing, including baseline reassessment timing, usage monitoring method, and any stated buffer pool or reversal treatment.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using a barrier approach and the VVB confirmed it in the verification report by TÜV NORD CERT GmbH.

- Leakage treatment is weakly documented, with a 0% deduction but no clear justification in the verification report, and reversal handling is not clearly addressed.

The verification report from TÜV NORD CERT GmbH confirms additionality through a barrier test, which is a positive sign. The monitoring period report states that no special reversal event occurred and no project equipment was exchanged during the monitoring period, but the record does not provide a buffer pool or a clear permanence framework. Leakage is weakly supported because the extracted facts show a 0% deduction, yet the justification is not addressed consistently.

### Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated as 1 January 2013 to 28 December 2017, and the verifier is identified in the verification report.

- The record does not state the usage monitoring method, baseline reassessment date, or any public registry completeness details beyond the CDM reference.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring period is clearly defined and the verifier is named, but several core MRV fields are missing. The record does not state the usage monitoring method, baseline reassessment timing, or any FNRB-related inputs, and registry completeness cannot be assessed from the extracted facts alone. The gap between claimed and verified reductions is visible, but the underlying calculation trail is not fully exposed in the available documents.

### Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The verified emission reductions are lower than the claimed amount, which suggests the verifier applied some downward adjustment rather than accepting the full claim.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and leakage justification is inconsistent across the extracted documents.

Claim safety is limited by the project-specific baseline and the incomplete leakage narrative. The verified emission reductions of 226,516 are below the claimed 242,713, which is reassuring, but the difference is not explained in the extracted record. Because CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available evidence.

### Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ Multiple document types were used, including the PDD, monitoring report, and verification report, and the verifier is named.

- The extraction confidence is only medium, the crediting period is not stated, and the verification report records several closed CARs and CLs.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. The evidence set includes the PDD, monitoring report, and verification report, and the verifier is identified, but the extraction confidence is only medium and the crediting period is not stated. The verification report also records multiple CARs and CLs that were closed, which suggests the file required substantial follow-up before acceptance.

## Risk Indicators

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| ● <b>Additionality</b> | VVB-confirmed barrier test                         |
| ● <b>Permanence</b>    | No reversal event, but buffer treatment not stated |
| ● <b>Leakage</b>       | 0% deduction with inconsistent justification       |
| ● <b>Baseline</b>      | Project baseline, reassessment timing missing      |
| ● <b>Safeguards</b>    | FPIC and grievance mechanism documented            |
| ● <b>Double-claim</b>  | CORSIA/CCP status not stated                       |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear leakage calculation note and reconcile the conflicting statements on whether leakage was deemed negligible or left unaddressed.

→ Disclose the baseline reassessment history, usage monitoring method, and any buffer or permanence treatment, along with the registry status for CORSIA and CCP eligibility.

## Documents Reviewed

- PA1351\_MonitoringReport\_MP7\_final.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_8th monitoring period\_19.01.2016 to 28.12.2017\_v5.pdf
- RBS GS MR Version 07 0 dated 29 07 2019.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_7th monitoring period\_01.01.2013 to 28.12.2017\_v5.pdf
- GS Passport\_28-03-18.pdf
- PDD\_20-10-13.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-820
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-820
- PA1351\_Verification\_Report\_DMRC\_MP7\_final.pdf
- Verification Report\_7th monitoring period\_01.01.2013 to 28.12.2017\_v1.pdf
- Verification Report\_8th monitoring period\_19.01.2016 to 28.12.2017\_v1.pdf
- 2019\_07\_31\_DMRC\_GS FVR\_final.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-2A341E55 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18  
 carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy