

QUALITY REPORT

Community Biogas Program

CE-community-biogas-pro · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-2F259E21 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core integrity elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring performance) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claim defensibility is high based on evidence gaps alone.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CE-community-biogas-pro
Sector	biogas
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability of any conclusions.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions are not found in the extracted record because no documents were available.

- Biogas projects can be high-impact, but without documents there is no basis to confirm non-renewable biomass assumptions, usage rates, or sustained operation.

No official documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), so additionality testing, baseline method selection, leakage treatment, and any buffer/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. For a community biogas program, integrity depends heavily on credible baseline fuel use and sustained digester operation, but neither can be checked without monitoring/verification reports. As a result, integrity is scored very low due to complete evidence gaps.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or claimed vs verified emission reductions are available in the extracted record.

- Registry/document completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were provided.

Transparency is weak because the extracted record contains no verification/monitoring reports, no VVB identification, and no monitoring period details. Claimed versus verified emission reductions and any error/uncertainty treatment are not found in the extracted record. With no accessible documentation, public MRV traceability cannot be established.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty around downstream claim risk.

- Key over-crediting drivers for biogas (usage monitoring and baseline fuelwood assumptions) are not documented in the extracted record.

Claim safety is low because the extracted record does not state whether the project is CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved, and provides no baseline or monitoring details to evaluate over-crediting risk. For biogas, assumptions about non-renewable biomass and stove/digester usage rates are central, but the extracted record contains none of these. This creates a high greenwashing/over-crediting risk from an evidence standpoint.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, so the documentation set is effectively missing.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues even if documents exist elsewhere.

Documentation is extremely weak: the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates low extraction confidence. With zero documents used, there is no way to assess recency, completeness, or whether any corrective actions were required. This triggers a high documentation risk and would deterministically cap transparency post-scoring under the stated gate rules (documentation below 3.0).

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer not documented
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC not documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV procedures can be assessed.
- Disclose registry details (issuance/retirement records), VVB name, monitoring period, and claimed vs verified emission reductions, including any findings and corrective actions.

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-2F259E21 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy