

## QUALITY REPORT

# Installation of Biogas Plant by INSEDA Members & Partners

GS-1140 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-0BE98A96 · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.2**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.8</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.6</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.8</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.2</b>

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 documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, key risk controls are weak or missing in the extracted record: leakage is not addressed, permanence protections are not evidenced, and several core monitoring details are not stated, which limits confidence in the crediting claims.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1140
Sector	biogas
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	Indicative programme, baseline and monitoring methodology for Small Scale Biogas 1
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	DNV Climate Change Services AS
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

## Red Flags

- Leakage is explicitly marked as not addressed, with no deduction or justification shown in the extracted record.
- No buffer pool, reversal history, or quantified monitoring results are available in the extracted facts, leaving permanence and issuance quality uncertain.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project used a barrier test under the small biodigester methodology.
- Leakage is not addressed, and no buffer pool or reversal protection is evidenced in the extracted record.

The validation report from DNV Climate Change Services AS confirms additionality through a barrier test, which is a positive sign for project integrity. At the same time, leakage is explicitly not addressed, and there is no evidence of a buffer pool or any reversal management in the extracted facts. The baseline is described as project-based, but the record does not show a reassessment date or other robustness checks.

### Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The verifier is named as DNV Climate Change Services AS, and the project documents include a validation report and PDD.
- The monitoring period, claimed versus verified emission reductions, and other core MRV quantities are not stated in the available record.

Transparency is limited by missing MRV detail in the extracted record. The project has a named verifier and the evidence set includes a validation report and PDD, but the monitoring period, total claimed versus verified emission reductions, and other key quantities are not stated. The annual survey usage monitoring method is noted, but without quantified results it is hard to assess completeness.

### Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + The project is not shown to be CORSIA-eligible, and CCP status is not mentioned, which avoids a clear dual-claim signal in the extracted facts.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed baseline, and leakage treatment is missing.

Claim safety is weakened by the absence of leakage treatment and by the use of a project-specific baseline. The record does not show CORSIA eligibility, and CCP status is only not mentioned, so there is no explicit dual-claim evidence but also no strong exclusion signal. Because the verified emission reduction figures are not available, over-crediting risk cannot be checked well from the extracted facts.

### Documentation — 5.2 / 10

- + Three evidence documents were used, and the validation report date is available, giving some documentary basis for review.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and several important fields such as monitoring period, buffer pool, and verified reductions are not found in the record.

Documentation quality is moderate rather than strong. Three documents were used, the verifier is identified, and the validation report date is available, but the extraction confidence is only medium. Important fields such as the monitoring period, buffer pool percentage, reversal details, and verified emission totals are not found in the available record, which limits confidence in the file completeness.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer or reversal evidence
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CCP/CORSIA status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide quantified monitoring results, including the monitoring period and verified emission reductions, with a clear reconciliation to claimed credits.

→ Document leakage assessment and permanence protections, including any buffer contribution, reversal monitoring, and how the baseline was periodically reviewed.

## Documents Reviewed

- (1)GS Passport 27.11.2009\_v1.pdf
- PDD 07.09.2011\_v3.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1140
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1140
- GS Validation Report 27.06.2011\_v1.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-0BE98A96 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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