

## QUALITY REPORT

# Implementation of clean energy technology in rural areas of India-1

GS-3655 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-CB6833F3 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>5.9</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.4</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.6</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.2</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.1</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 quantified leakage treatment, and documented safeguards. However, the record also shows unresolved baseline and crediting-period contradictions, no buffer pool information, and no reported ERR totals, which limits confidence in the claim quality.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3655
Sector	biogas
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS-I.E Version 12
Crediting Period	2021 — 2026
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2025
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

## Red Flags

- The documents contain contradictions on the FNRB method, the verified usage rate, the FNRB value, and the crediting period, which weakens reliability.
- No buffer pool percentage, reversal treatment, or ERR totals are stated in the extracted record, leaving permanence and issuance reconciliation only partially evidenced.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the verification report says the project used a quantified leakage treatment.
- Baseline reassessment timing, buffer pool coverage, and reversal handling are not stated in the available documents.

The verification report confirms additionality was checked by the VVB, and it also states that leakage was quantified rather than ignored. On the other hand, the extracted record does not state a buffer pool percentage, does not describe any reversal events in a way that resolves permanence risk, and does not provide a baseline reassessment date. The closed clarifications and corrective action requests are manageable, but they still reduce confidence in the robustness of the project design evidence.

### Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + The monitoring period, VVB name, and usage monitoring approach are stated, and the project documents include both verification and monitoring records.
- Total ERR claimed versus verified is not found in the extracted record, and the record shows several internal contradictions.

The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a stated annual-survey usage monitoring method, which supports basic MRV visibility. However, the extracted record does not provide total ERR claimed or verified, so issuance reconciliation cannot be checked from the available facts. The presence of multiple contradictions also weakens transparency because the underlying documentation is not fully internally consistent.

### Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

- + The verification report supports a local-field FNRB approach and reports a very high FNRB value, which is generally stronger than a generic default.
- The verified usage rate is extremely low at 0.073, while an older monitoring report reportedly used 100, creating a major inconsistency risk.

Claim safety is helped by the VVB-supported local-field FNRB method and the reported FNRB value of 95.61, which suggests a strong non-renewable biomass baseline assumption. But the contradiction between the verified usage rate of 0.073 and an older monitoring report value of 100 is a major red flag for over-crediting risk. CORSIA eligibility is marked true, while CCP status is not mentioned, so dual-channel claim risk is not fully resolved.

### Documentation — 6.1 / 10

- + The evidence set is broad, with multiple document types used, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- The verification report notes five clarifications and two corrective action requests, even though they were closed, which indicates documentation issues.

The evidence base is reasonably broad, with multiple document types used and a medium extraction confidence level. The project also has documented safeguards, including FPIC and a grievance mechanism, and the verification report says the clarifications and corrective action requests were satisfactorily closed. Still, the record lacks several key quantitative fields, and the contradictions suggest the documentation is not fully clean or harmonized across sources.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	buffer and reversal treatment unclear
● <b>Leakage</b>	quantified but deduction not stated
● <b>Baseline</b>	project baseline with timing uncertainty
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verified and claimed ERR totals, along with a clear reconciliation table for the monitoring period.

→ Publish a harmonized explanation of the FNRB method, usage rate, and crediting-period dates across all documents, including any buffer pool or reversal treatment.

## Documents Reviewed

- VER calc\_ GS11655-1st\_MP\_22022023.xlsx
- GS-11655\_MR v03\_18-12-24 CC(1).pdf
- GS-11655\_MR v05\_clean\_(1).pdf
- GS11655-3rd\_MP\_18-12-2024\_ks(1).xlsx
- GS11655-SG tool\_1st MP.xlsx
- GS11655-2nd\_MP\_V02.xlsx
- GS-11655\_MR v02.pdf
- GS-11655\_MR v03\_25-11-25 - Clean.pdf
- GS-11655\_MR 03\_clean.pdf
- GS11655-ex ante cal\_22022023.xlsx
- GS 11655\_SDG-Impact-Tool\_v04.xlsx
- GS11655-4th\_MP\_07-11-2025\_ks.xlsx
- GS11655-Stakeholder Consultation Report\_v1.pdf
- GS 11655 - PDD\_v5.0\_clean.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3655
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3655
- CCIPL 2508- FVR.Finaldocx 2 Clean(1).pdf
- CCIPL 2834- FVR\_Clean\_.pdf
- CCIPL\_1476\_FVR\_GS11655\_Verification\_clean(1).pdf
- CCIPL\_1476\_FVR\_GS11655\_Validation-cl[18767].pdf
- CCIPL\_1476\_FVR\_GS11655\_Verification.pdf
- CCIPL 2004- FVR Ver 03\_Final\_Clean (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-CB6833F3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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