QUALITY REPORT

Doo Doo Does More

CE-methane-capture-prog · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-C91B005C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This Gold Standard household biogas project shows moderate integrity: additionality is confirmed by the VVB and there are no reported material findings or corrective actions. However, key quantifications (notably leakage deduction and permanence provisions) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and there is a notable inconsistency in reported claimed ERs across documents, increasing over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CE-methane-capture-prog
Sector	biogas
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS I.E 05
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Limited
Verified ERs	40,668 tCO_2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Inconsistent claimed emission reductions across documents (validation report vs monitoring report), indicating data reliability risk.

■ Leakage is described as “quantified” but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

The extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier analysis, which supports additionality robustness for a household biogas activity. The baseline approach is project-specific (“project” baseline method), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens baseline robustness over a long crediting period (2012-05-09 — 2022-05-08). Leakage is described as “quantified,” but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, creating uncertainty about whether leakage was conservatively applied.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated (2021-05-09 — 2022-05-08) and the VVB is identified as Carbon Check (India) Private Limited.

- Key MRV parameters are missing from the extracted record (e.g., verified usage rate and leakage deduction percentage), limiting reproducibility.

The monitoring period is clearly defined (2021-05-09 — 2022-05-08) and the VVB is named (Carbon Check (India) Private Limited), which supports traceability. The monitoring approach for usage is described as an annual survey, but neither the assumed nor verified usage rate is found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess whether non-usage was properly accounted for. The record provides both claimed and verified ER totals, but inconsistencies across documents reduce transparency on what was ultimately asserted versus monitored.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ Verified ERs are provided (40,668 tCO_2e) for the stated monitoring period, supporting some confidence in issued/verified quantities.

- Claimed ER figures conflict across documents, elevating over-crediting/greenwashing risk unless reconciled.

The monitoring documentation provides verified emission reductions of 40,668 tCO_2e for the stated monitoring period, which is a positive signal for claim defensibility. However, the claimed ER value is inconsistent across documents (validation report vs monitoring report), which increases the risk of overstated claims if communications rely on the higher figure. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess cross-program claim risks from the extracted record alone.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are available (PDD, monitoring report, validation report) with high extraction confidence.

- Some critical fields are not found in the extracted record (e.g., FPIC, benefit sharing, buffer/pooling or reversal risk treatment).

The evidence set includes a PDD, monitoring report, and validation report, and the minimum extraction confidence is high, indicating the underlying documents were readable and extractable. The monitoring report is dated 2022-08-22, which is reasonably close to the 2021–2022 monitoring period. Nonetheless, several important social and risk-management elements (FPIC, benefit sharing, buffer pool/reversal provisions) are not found in the extracted record, reducing completeness.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
Permanence	Avoidance project but reversal provisions not evidenced
Leakage	Quantified but deduction not evidenced
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment not stated
Safeguards	Safeguards and grievance noted; FPIC not evidenced
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or clearly extract the applied leakage deduction percentage and its calculation, and reconcile it to the stated “quantified” leakage approach in the monitoring documentation.

→ Reconcile and explain the claimed ER discrepancy across the validation and monitoring reports (including which figure is applicable to which period/version) and disclose verified usage rates from the annual survey.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report - 2019
- 2020 Monitoring Report
- 2021 Monitoring Report
- Project Description - 2014
- 2021 Verification Report

Report ID: CM-C91B005C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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