

QUALITY REPORT

*Bagepalli CDM Biogas Programme

GS-697 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-3183929D · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.8
■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some governance and monitoring elements (verification reports, VVB present, monitoring period and ERRs reported) but contains multiple contradictions across documents, unresolved reversal treatment, and corrective actions. These issues reduce confidence in additionality, leakage treatment and permanence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-697
Sector	biogas
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS.I.E ver.5
Crediting Period	2013 — 2020
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Limited
Verified ERs	11,761 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Contradictory documented usage rates (54.59 vs 80.68) across reports, reducing confidence in emission reductions.
- Reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is provided.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- Reversal events not addressed in available documents and buffer pool percentage not stated (verification report and merged facts).

~ Uncertain additionality: a combined additionality test is reported but additionality confirmation by the independent verifier is not stated in the extracted record.

The project uses a project-specific baseline methodology (AMS.I.E ver.5) with a baseline reassessment in 2017 (verification report), which supports baseline validity. However, reversal treatment is weak: reversal events are recorded as not addressed in the merged record and no buffer pool percentage is provided, increasing permanence risk. Several corrective actions (CAR-01, CAR-02, CAR-03) were raised and some closed, which shows issues were found during verification (verification report 2019). Additionality is reported as a combined test but the extracted record does not state that the VVB explicitly confirmed additionality, creating uncertainty.

Transparency — 5.5 / 10

+ Verification report (2019) and monitoring report provide monitoring period and identical total ERR claimed and verified (11761 tCO₂e), indicating consistency for that metric.

- Multiple contradictions across documents (usage, fnrB, leakage deduction) and only medium extraction confidence; recent monitoring/verification documents disagree on key inputs.

A named VVB (Carbon Check India) and monitoring period (2020-09-01 — 2021-08-31) are provided and total ERR claimed equals the total ERR verified (11761), which is a transparency positive (verification report). The project has 18 documents and includes PDD, validation, verification and monitoring reports. However, the extracted record has medium extraction confidence and notable contradictions across documents (usage rates, fnrB, leakage deduction), reducing clarity and auditability.

Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

- Conflicting usage rates (54.59 in monitoring report 2023 vs 80.68 in earlier verification 2017) and conflicting fnrB values (0.95 vs 0.85) create over-crediting risk.

+ Leakage deduction of 5% is documented in a verification report (2017), which is a conservative treatment compared with an earlier 0% — but records are inconsistent across reports.

There is a material risk of over-crediting because key parameters conflict between documents: usage rate is recorded as 54.59 in the most recent monitoring report but 80.68 in an earlier verification report, and fnrB is reported as 0.95 in one verification and 0.85 in a monitoring report. CORSIA/CCP eligibility is not stated. While a leakage deduction of 5% is reported in a verification report (2017), earlier documents show 0%, demonstrating inconsistent treatment of leakage across time and documents.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ A range of documents are present (PDD, validation, verification, monitoring reports) and 18 documents were used.

- min_extraction_confidence is medium and there are multiple corrective actions recorded (CARs and CLs), indicating documentation or implementation gaps.

Documentation coverage is moderate: evidence includes PDD, validation, verification and monitoring reports and 18 documents were used. The latest verification report in the extracted record is dated 2019, and monitoring data for 2020–2021 are provided. However, min_extraction_confidence is medium and several corrective actions remain listed as required, and safeguards are inconsistently documented across reports, which reduces the documentation score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	combined test reported; VVB confirmation not stated
● Permanence	reversal treatment unclear; no buffer pct stated
● Leakage	leakage deduction applied but inconsistent across reports
● Baseline	project baseline with reassessment (2017)
● Safeguards	safeguards not consistently documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide clear VVB statement confirming additionality and publish the confirmation in the registry record.

→ Resolve contradictions by updating and republishing a consolidated monitoring report that reconciles usage rate, fnrB and leakage deduction, and explicitly state reversal and buffer arrangements.

Documents Reviewed

- Bagepalli CDM Biogas Programme Annual Report 2022.pdf
- Bagepalli CDM Biogas Programme Annual Report 2021.pdf
- (3)Monitoring Report_5th monitoring period_01.09.2013 to 31.12.2016_v1.pdf
- (5)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.09.2006 to 31.08.2007_v1.pdf
- (4)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.09.2007 to 31.07.2009_v1.pdf
- (4)Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.08.2009 to 31.07.2011_v1.pdf
- (3)Monitoring Report_6th monitoring period_01.01.2017 to 31.12.2018_v1.pdf
- ADATS-ER Calculations 2020-21-Vintage wise.xlsx
- (4)Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01.08.2011 to 31.08.2013_v1.pdf
- Monitoring-Report-2021-22-ADATS-V4-after GS Review-Clean(1).pdf
- (4)PDD 11.05.2017_v6.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-697
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-697
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01.09.2006 to 31.07.2007.pdf
- (4)Verification Report_4th monitoring period_01.08.2011 to 31.08.2013_v2.1.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01.08.2009 to 31.07.2011.pdf
- FVR GS-410 -Clean(1).pdf
- (4)Verification Report_5th monitoring period_01.09.2013 to 31.12.2016_v2.pdf
- (3)Verification Report_6th monitoring period_01.01.2017 to 31.12.2018_v3.pdf
- Validation Report 06.08.2013_v1.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01.09.2007 to 31.07.2009.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-3183929D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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