

## QUALITY REPORT

# Social Education and Development Society (SEDS) Biogas CDM project for the rural poor

GS-1156 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-E11D1630 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.4**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.1</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.2</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.0</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>4.6</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage deduction, but the evidence is weakened by unresolved contradictions and a large gap between claimed and verified ERs. Transparency is only moderate because the monitoring approach is described, yet key items such as verified usage rates and registry eligibility status are not stated in the extracted record. Overall, this looks like a real project with documented safeguards, but the reliability of the emissions claim is limited by inconsistent source records and weak disclosure on several core MRV items.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1156
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS. I.E. Switch from non-renewable biomass for thermal applications by the user Version 7
Crediting Period	2018 — 2024
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Verified ERs	9,932 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- Verified emissions reductions are far below the amount claimed, with 9,932 verified versus 28,700 claimed in the verification report.
- The extracted record contains multiple contradictions on usage monitoring, FNRB, leakage deduction, safeguards, and crediting period, which reduces confidence in the reported figures.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB accepted it.

- The verification report shows a large gap between claimed and verified reductions, and reversal events are not addressed.

The verification report confirms additionality using a combined test, and the VVB accepted that assessment, which is a meaningful positive. The project also reports a quantified leakage deduction of 5% and a project baseline, but reversal events are not addressed and the buffer pool is not found in the extracted record. The very large difference between claimed and verified ERs raises concern about the robustness of the emissions accounting.

### Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated for 2020-01-01 to 2021-12-31, and the project has a named VVB.

- Verified usage rates, CORSIA eligibility, and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, limiting registry transparency.

The monitoring period is clearly stated, the VVB is named as 4K Earth Science Private Limited, and the report includes a list of corrective actions and closures. However, verified usage rates are not found in the extracted record, and CORSIA eligibility is not stated. CCP status is also only noted as not mentioned, so registry-level transparency remains limited.

### Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline and applies a quantified leakage deduction of 5%, which supports some claim discipline.

- The claimed 28,700 ERs versus 9,932 verified ERs suggests substantial over-claim risk, and the FNRB basis is disputed across documents.

Claim safety is weakened by the gap between 28,700 claimed ERs and 9,932 verified ERs in the verification report. The project uses a project baseline and a 5% leakage deduction, which helps, but the FNRB basis is inconsistent across documents: the newer record privileges a national default over an older state-level value. Because usage monitoring is based on annual surveys and the verified usage rate is not stated, over-crediting risk remains material.

### Documentation — 4.6 / 10

+ The record draws on many extracted facts and the verification report includes multiple corrective actions and closures.

- One or more source documents were only moderately readable, and the record contains several contradictions across dates and values.

The record includes a substantial number of extracted facts and the verification report is dated 2023-07-12, which is reasonably recent relative to the crediting period. Still, the extraction confidence is only medium, and the evidence set is incomplete because several key fields are not found in the extracted record. The repeated corrective-action entries suggest documentation exists, but the contradictions reduce confidence in completeness and consistency.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed combined test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal treatment stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	5% quantified deduction
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline with reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA eligibility not stated; CCP not mentioned

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled MRV table explaining the gap between claimed and verified ERs, with source-by-source resolution of all contradictions.

→ Disclose verified usage rates, CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, and a clear reversal/buffer treatment statement in the public documentation.

## Documents Reviewed

- (2)Monitoring Report\_2nd monitoring period\_01.01.2013 to 04.30.2014\_v2.pdf
- GS Vintage wise SEDS\_CER Calculation\_2022-V3.xlsx
- Monitoring Report\_5th monitoring report\_01.01.2018 to 31.12.2019\_v5.pdf
- (2)Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_01.01.2011 to 12.31.2012\_v2.pdf
- T-PerfCert\_V1.1-Monitoring-Report-V3-clean.pdf
- (2)Monitoring Report\_3rd monitoring period\_05.01.2014 to 10.31.2015\_v3.pdf
- (1)SEDS SD Report 2019 V2.pdf
- SEDS\_GS\_CER\_calculations-2017-V2.xlsx
- Transition-SEDS-V3.pdf
- GS Passport\_08.08.2018\_v9.pdf
- Transition-SEDS-V2-clean(1).pdf
- PDD\_31.05.2018\_v14.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1156
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1156
- (2)Verification Report\_3rd monitoring period\_05.01.2014 to 10.31.2015\_v1.pdf
- GS Validation Report 06.06.2018\_v2.pdf
- (2)Verification Report\_1st monitoring period\_01.01.2011 to 31.31.2012.pdf
- GS Verification report\_SEDS\_12072023\_Clean.pdf
- (2)Verification Report\_2nd monitoring period\_01.01.2013 to 04.30.2014.pdf
- (1)GS Verification\_Report\_SEDS.pdf
- Verification Report\_5th monitoring report\_01.01.2018 to 31.12.2019\_v2.1.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-E11D1630 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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