QUALITY REPORT

24MW Power Generation from Coking Waste Heat Generated in the Clean-type Heat-recovery Coke Ovens at Shanxi Sinochem Wonder Industries Co. Ltd.

CDM-1717 · CDM · China

Report ID: CM-4E303DFC · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.2

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	4.6
Transparency (25%)	3.8
Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a CDM industrial energy-recovery project with VVB-verified additionality, but the record has notable documentation gaps and some reliability issues. Leakage is not addressed in the extracted validation material, and the project has two corrective action requests plus low extraction confidence, which weakens confidence in the claim quality.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1717
Sector	industrial
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0004 02
Crediting Period	2008 — 2015
VVB	Det Norske Veritas Certification AS
Monitoring Period	2008 — 2009
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

■ Leakage treatment is not addressed in the validation report, and no quantified deduction is available.

■ The extracted record shows contradictions on additionality method, leakage treatment, and crediting period, reducing reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.6 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by Det Norske Veritas Certification AS using an investment test in the validation report.

- Leakage is not addressed in the validation report, and no buffer pool or reversal protection is stated.

The validation report from Det Norske Veritas Certification AS confirms additionality through an investment test, which supports the project's core integrity case. However, leakage is not addressed in the validation material, no buffer pool or reversal protection is stated, and the extracted record shows two corrective action requests. Overall integrity is therefore only moderate.

Transparency — 3.8 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period in the validation report.

- Verified and claimed emission reduction totals are not stated in the extracted record, and extraction confidence is low.

The project has a named VVB and a clearly stated monitoring period, which helps traceability. But the extracted record does not provide verified or claimed emission reduction totals, and key operational details such as leakage treatment and usage monitoring are missing. Low extraction confidence further weakens transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline under ACM0004, which is at least methodologically identifiable.

- Leakage justification is missing, and the record contains a contradiction between an investment test and a benchmark test.

Claim safety is constrained by missing leakage treatment and the absence of quantified emission reduction figures in the extracted record. The project uses ACM0004 with a project baseline, but the record does not show a recent reassessment or robust public accounting details. The contradiction between an investment test in the validation report and a benchmark test in the PDD adds some reliability concern.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ Seven documents were used, including a validation report and PDD, and FPIC is mentioned.

- Two corrective action requests were issued, and the extraction confidence is low because at least one key document was poorly readable.

Documentation is mixed: seven documents were used, including a validation report and PDD, and FPIC is mentioned. Still, two corrective action requests were required, and the extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was difficult to read. The crediting period and leakage treatment also appear inconsistently reported across documents.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No reversal treatment stated
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed
● **Baseline**	Project baseline stated
● **Safeguards**	FPIC mentioned, grievance not stated
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete monitoring report with verified and claimed emission reduction totals, leakage treatment, and usage monitoring details.

→ Resolve the document contradictions on additionality method and crediting period, and publish clearer evidence for corrective actions and safeguard implementation.

Documents Reviewed

- approval
- 18 Jul 2008 - 25 Dec 2009
- Appendix 1 - P IRR
- registration request form
- project design document
- Validation report

Report ID: CM-4E303DFC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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