QUALITY REPORT

Accion Fraterna Biogas CDM project for rural communities in Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh

GS-1290 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-CADED9D0 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.1
Transparency (25%)	5.8
Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This biogas project has some solid safeguards and a quantified leakage deduction, but the evidence base is uneven and several key items are either not stated or internally inconsistent. The most important reliability issue is the contradiction on the crediting period and the shift in FNRB and monitoring approach across documents, which weakens confidence in the project's accounting even though the latest verification report is clean.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1290
Sector	biogas
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS.I. E 11.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2026
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2025
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- The crediting period differs between documents, with the latest verification report using a shorter period than an older monitoring report.
- The FNRB and usage-monitoring approach changed across documents, which raises consistency and over-crediting concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ The verification report from 2026 reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, and it confirms a quantified leakage deduction of 5%.

- Additionality is not explicitly confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, and reversal risk is not fully addressed because reversal events are marked as not addressed despite a note saying no extreme event occurred.

The latest verification report dated 2026-02-18 reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports a moderate integrity score. Leakage is quantified at 5%, and the project is a biogas heat activity under AMS.I.E, which is generally straightforward, but additionality is not explicitly confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record. Reversal risk is only partially handled: the report says no extreme event occurred, yet the extracted reversal field is marked as not addressed, so permanence confidence is not strong.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier, 4K Earth Science Private Limited, and the monitoring period is clearly stated in the 2026 verification report.

- Total verified and claimed emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and the monitoring approach has a contradiction between annual survey and self-reporting in earlier material.

Transparency is helped by the presence of a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and a recent verification report. However, the extracted record does not state total claimed or verified emission reductions, and the monitoring method is inconsistent across documents, with the latest report using annual surveys while an older appendix referenced self-reporting. That inconsistency reduces the clarity and auditability of the MRV trail.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline that was last reassessed in 2021, and the latest FNRB value is 0.737 rather than the older 0.91 figure.

- The contradiction in FNRB values and the absence of stated usage-rate assumptions reduce confidence that the claimed reductions are conservative.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a project baseline and reports a quantified leakage deduction, but the accounting inputs are not fully stable across documents. The latest FNRB value is 0.737 from a monitoring report, while the older PDD used 0.91, and the latest monitoring approach differs from earlier self-reporting. Those contradictions increase the risk of over-crediting relative to a more conservative, fully consistent evidence set.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ Four evidence document types were used, the extraction confidence is high, and the latest verification report is recent.

- Some key fields are not stated in the extracted record, including buffer pool coverage and registry-claim status, which limits completeness.

Documentation is reasonably good overall: four document types were used, the extraction confidence is high, and the latest verification report is recent. The project also includes FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing language, which improves the completeness of the record. Still, several important items are not stated in the extracted record, including buffer pool coverage and registry-claim status, so the file is not fully complete.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Additionality present but not VVB-confirmed in extracted rec
Permanence	No reversal event reported, but reversal handling is not ful
Leakage	Leakage quantified at 5%
Baseline	Project baseline stated, but reassessment timing and consist
Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are documente
Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide explicit VVB confirmation of additionality and a clear, current permanence assessment with buffer or reversal treatment.

→ Publish a reconciled MRV note that explains the FNRB change, the monitoring-method change, and the basis for the current crediting period.

Documents Reviewed

- AF-Monitoring-Report-2023-2025-v3_Clean.pdf
- Accion Fraterna Biogas CDM project Annual Report 2025.pdf
- GS Passport_06.06.2012_v6.pdf
- Transition Annex_31.05.2014_v2.2.pdf
- PDD_01.19.2012_v6.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1290
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1290
- GS980 - FVR - AF - 6th Monitoring Period_Clean_R2.pdf

Report ID: CM-CADED9D0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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