

QUALITY REPORT

Arakalagudu Biodigester Project II

GS-1158 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-320EF25E · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
■ Transparency (25%)	4.3
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.8
■ Documentation (15%)	3.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a moderately documented biogas project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated leakage deduction, but the record has important reliability gaps. The biggest concerns are contradictory evidence on grievance handling, leakage treatment, reversal history, and the crediting period, plus low extraction confidence from at least one hard-to-read document.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1158
Sector	biogas
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Indicative programme, baseline, and monitoring methodology for Small Scale Biodigester null
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	Gold Standard for the Global Goals
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The extracted record says leakage is not addressed, yet an earlier document reportedly quantified leakage; this inconsistency weakens confidence in the emissions accounting.
- A reversal-related issue was reported in an earlier document, but the later record says reversal events are not addressed, which raises permanence and reporting concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test.

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, and reversal handling is not clearly documented in the latest record.

The project has a positive integrity signal because additionality was confirmed by the VVB and the project used a combined additionality test. However, the baseline is project-specific, leakage is inconsistently described, and the latest record does not clearly address reversal events even though an earlier document reportedly did. The 10% leakage deduction helps, but the contradictory treatment of leakage and reversals reduces confidence in the emissions integrity.

Transparency — 4.3 / 10

+ The monitoring period, VVB name, and usage monitoring approach are stated in the available record.

- Total verified and claimed emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, and extraction confidence is low.

The record identifies the VVB, the monitoring period from 2018-01-01 to 2020-01-31, and an annual survey for usage monitoring, which supports some transparency. On the other hand, total claimed and verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is low, suggesting incomplete or hard-to-verify documentation. The absence of a clear registry-level emissions trail limits transparency further.

Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

+ The project applies a 10% leakage deduction and uses a national default for non-renewable biomass.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, and contradictions around leakage and reversals increase over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is moderate but not strong. The project uses a national default for non-renewable biomass and applies a 10% leakage deduction, which is better than leaving leakage untreated, but the baseline remains project-specific rather than standardized. The contradictions on leakage and reversal reporting increase the risk of over-crediting, and CORSIA or CCP status is not stated in the available record.

Documentation — 3.2 / 10

+ Multiple official-document fields are available, including monitoring dates, methodology, and safeguard references.

- At least one key document was poorly readable, and the crediting-period dates conflict between documents.

Documentation is only fair because several core items are present, including the methodology, monitoring period, safeguard references, and VVB identity. Still, the record has low extraction confidence, no material findings or corrective actions, and conflicting crediting-period dates across documents. I privileged the later 2020-06-15 extraction for the main values because it is the most recent consolidated record, but the older documents still matter because they show unresolved inconsistencies.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No clear buffer or reversal treatment
● Leakage	Deduction present but contradictory
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC present, grievance unclear
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clean, reconciled emissions package showing claimed versus verified reductions, leakage treatment, and reversal handling in one consistent document set.

→ Publish a clear safeguards and registry disclosure package, including grievance mechanism status, crediting-period reconciliation, and explicit CORSIA/CCP eligibility statements.

Documents Reviewed

- (4)Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01.01.2013 to 31.12.2013_v2.docx
- (5)Monitoring Report_6th monitoring period_01.01.2015 to 31.12.2015_v2.pdf
- Monitoring Report_10th monitoring period_01.01.2018 to 31.01.2020_v3.pdf
- (5)Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.01.2012 to 31.12.2012_v1.pdf
- (5)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.01.2011 to 31.12.2011_v1.docx
- (4)Monitoring Report_5th monitoring period_01.01.2014 to 31.12.2014_v2.pdf
- (5)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.02.2010 to 31.12.2010_v2.pdf
- GS817 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report 03.01.2010.pdf
- GS817 Cover Letter.pdf
- GS 817 _Transition-Annex_V1_23 04 2020.pdf
- GS 817 _Transition-Annex_V2 15 06 2020.pdf
- (2)PDD_12.23.2010_v4.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1158
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1158
- (1)GS Validation Report_24.12.2010_rev4.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-320EF25E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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