

QUALITY REPORT

Micro Scale Biogas CDM Project of CROSS

GS-123 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-E2659867 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a moderately documented biogas project with VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and no reported reversal events in the latest record. However, several key items are either not stated or inconsistent across documents, including usage monitoring, safeguard history, and the crediting period, which reduces confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-123
Sector	biogas
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS I.E. Switch from Non-Renewable Biomass for Thermal Applications by the User Version 11/5/
Crediting Period	2021 — 2025
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2025 — 2025
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	28 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The crediting period in the latest record differs from an earlier document, creating uncertainty about which issuance window applies.
- Reversal status and leakage treatment are inconsistent across documents, and some key operational metrics such as verified usage rate are not stated.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under the CDM methodology.
- The project-specific baseline is less robust than a standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and the latest record does not state a buffer pool.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the VVB confirmed additionality and the methodology is identified as a combined test under the stated CDM approach. Leakage is not ignored: the record shows a quantified deduction of 5%, and the latest monitoring record reports no reversal events. That said, the baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized baseline, and the buffer pool is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens permanence confidence.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

- + The monitoring period, VVB name, and leakage deduction are stated, and the record includes a substantial set of extracted documents.
- Total claimed versus verified emission reductions are not stated, and the usage rate verified by monitoring is not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is mixed. The monitoring period, VVB identity, and leakage deduction are available, and the project record includes many extracted documents. However, total emission reductions claimed versus verified are not stated, and the verified usage rate is also not found, which limits the ability to check issuance quality. The medium extraction confidence also suggests at least one key source was not fully readable.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + Leakage is quantified at 5%, which is better than an unaddressed leakage assumption.
- The project relies on a national default for non-renewable biomass and does not state a verified usage rate, leaving some over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is moderate rather than strong. The quantified leakage deduction helps, but the project uses a national default for non-renewable biomass and does not provide a verified usage rate, so the risk of over-crediting is not fully resolved. The latest record also shows operational issues in the biogas units, including non-operational units and end-user demolition, which can affect realized climate benefit.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + The record draws on many extracted documents and includes a named VVB, which supports basic documentation quality.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and multiple corrective actions were required, indicating documentation gaps and review issues.

Documentation is fair but not strong. The extracted record references 25 documents and names the VVB, which is helpful, but the extraction confidence is only medium. Multiple corrective actions were required, and the record contains several closed findings, suggesting the documentation trail needed substantial follow-up. The crediting period also appears to have changed across documents, which adds uncertainty about record consistency.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No reversals reported, but no buffer pool stated
● Leakage	Leakage quantified at 5%
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear reconciliation of the conflicting crediting period, leakage deduction, reversal status, and safeguard records across the source documents.

→ Publish verified usage-rate data, total claimed versus verified emission reductions, and any buffer pool or permanence provisions for the project.

Documents Reviewed

- Micro Scale Biogas CDM Project of CROSS Annual Report 2022.pdf
- Micro Scale Biogas CDM Project of CROSS Annual Report 2021.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.04.2017 to 31.07.2019_v4.pdf
- Micro Scale Biogas CDM Project of CROSS Annual Report 2025.pdf
- CROSS Monitoring-Report-2021-22-V3.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.08.2019 to 31.12.2020_v3.pdf
- CROSS Monitoring-Report-2023-25-V3_Clean.pdf
- GS_SD_CROSS Monitoring Report-V3.pdf
- Micro Scale Biogas CDM Project of CROSS Annual Report 2024.pdf
- T-PreReview_V1.2-Project-Design-Document.pdf
- ER calculations-CROSS-renewal-v5.xlsx
- Transition-CROSS-V3.pdf
- CROSS - Transition request form project-V2.docx
- GS Passport_30.12.13_v3.pdf
- CROSS ER Calculations-V2-2023-25.xlsx
- PDD_06.12.12_v2.1.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-123
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-123
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-04-2017 to 31-07-2019_v02.pdf
- GS Verification report _CROSS MP4.pdf
- Validation Report_12.05.2021_v2.pdf
- GS1199_ Micro Scale Biogas CDM Project of CROSS_FVR_Clean.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01.08.2019 to 31.12.2020_v1.pdf
- CDM Verification report.pdf
- GS Validation Report_CROSS_v1.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01.04.2017 to 31.07.2019_v2.1.pdf
- (2)GS Verification_Report_CROSS.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-E2659867 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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