

QUALITY REPORT

2*6MW Coke Oven Gas Power Generation Project in Xiangcheng County

CDM-1721 · CDM · China

Report ID: CM-DB847417 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	3.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This CDM project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a named verifier, but the record also shows many unresolved validation issues and weak evidence on leakage and permanence. The documentation is incomplete for key MRV fields, and the project is not clearly positioned as low-risk for over-crediting or double-claim concerns.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1721
Sector	other
Country	China
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0004 2
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	Det Norske Veritas Certification AS
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- The validation report lists many corrective actions and clarifications, which suggests substantial documentation and design issues at validation.
- Leakage and permanence are not properly addressed in the extracted record, and no buffer pool or reversal treatment is stated.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by Det Norske Veritas Certification AS in the validation report, which is stronger than an unverified claim.

- The validation report records multiple corrective actions and clarifications, and leakage treatment is not addressed in the extracted record.

The validation report from Det Norske Veritas Certification AS confirms additionality, which supports the project's core environmental claim. However, the same report lists three corrective action requests and thirteen clarifications, indicating that the project design and evidence base needed substantial follow-up. Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, and no buffer pool or reversal treatment is stated, so permanence and leakage robustness remain weak.

Transparency — 3.6 / 10

+ A named VVB is available, and the project is clearly identified as a CDM activity with a defined crediting period.

- Key MRV fields such as the monitoring period, verified emission reductions, and usage monitoring details are not found in the available documents.

Transparency is limited because several key monitoring and accounting fields are not found in the available documents, including the monitoring period, verified emission totals, and usage monitoring method. The project is clearly identified as CDM-1721 with a named verifier and a defined crediting period, which helps traceability. Still, the absence of quantified MRV outputs reduces confidence in public claim support.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

+ The project uses ACM0004 under the CDM, which provides a recognized methodological framework.

- The baseline is described only as project-based, leakage justification is not addressed, and there is no evidence in the extracted record to rule out over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is only moderate because the project uses a recognized CDM methodology, but the baseline is described only as project-based and not as a recently reassessed standardized baseline. Leakage justification is not addressed, and there is no verified usage-rate evidence in the extracted record. With no clear CORSIA or CCP status stated, the record does not provide strong protection against over-crediting or dual-claim concerns.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ Seven documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- The validation report is dated 2009, but several core fields remain missing or not stated, and the record includes many CARs and CLs.

Documentation quality is mixed. Seven documents were used and extraction confidence is medium, which is acceptable, but the validation report is old and the record still lacks several core quantitative fields. The many corrective actions and clarifications also suggest that the documentation package was not fully clean at validation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	no buffer or reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	leakage not addressed
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC noted, grievance mechanism not found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the monitoring report with verified emission reductions, monitoring period, and usage monitoring details.
- Document leakage treatment, permanence safeguards, and the resolution of all CARs and clarifications in a complete audit trail.

Documents Reviewed

- Appendix 3 - 20090421_xiangcheng COG project IRR and sentivity analysis_Final_mcl.xls_1721
- Appendix 1 - Loan
- approval
- registration request form
- Appendix 2 - IRR COG
- Validation report

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-DB847417 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy