

QUALITY REPORT

25.3MW WHR Project of Zhejiang Leomax Group

CDM-1874 · CDM · China

Report ID: CM-7B577CE0 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This CDM waste-heat recovery project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated negligible leakage treatment. However, the record also shows multiple corrective actions and a material mismatch between the registered PDD and the installed equipment, which weakens confidence in the project documentation and implementation consistency. Public-facing MRV detail is limited in the extracted record, and the project is marked CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not stated, leaving some claim-risk uncertainty.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1874
Sector	other
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AM0024 version 01
Crediting Period	null
VVB	SGS United Kingdom Ltd
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2011
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- The verification report lists multiple corrective actions and notes that the implemented project does not conform to the registered PDD in several equipment details.
- Leakage is described as negligible in the validation report, but the PDD later appears to leave leakage unaddressed, creating a documentation inconsistency.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the validation report used a combined test rather than relying on a single weak screen.

- The verification findings include multiple corrective actions and a documented mismatch between the registered PDD and the installed turbine/generator specifications.

The validation report confirms additionality using a combined test and says the VVB verified it, which supports the project's core eligibility case. Leakage was treated as negligible with a zero deduction, but the verification findings also list many corrective actions and state that the implemented activity does not conform to the registered PDD in several equipment details, which weakens integrity confidence. No buffer pool or reversal management is stated, and reversal events are marked as not addressed, so permanence is not fully evidenced.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has named documents from validation, monitoring, and the PDD, with SGS United Kingdom Ltd identified as the VVB.

- Key MRV details are missing from the extracted record, including verified emission reductions, usage monitoring method, and any reassessment of the baseline.

The extracted record identifies SGS United Kingdom Ltd as the VVB and includes validation, monitoring, and PDD documents, which is a positive sign for traceability. At the same time, key monitoring fields are missing or not stated in available documents, including verified emission reductions, usage monitoring method, and any baseline reassessment. The monitoring period is provided, but the overall MRV picture remains incomplete in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The validation report says leakage was deemed negligible and applies a zero leakage deduction.

- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so the claim environment is not fully closed off.

Claim safety is mixed because the project has a standard CDM methodology and a stated negligible leakage treatment, but the record does not provide the underlying monitoring detail needed to fully test over-crediting risk. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so the claim environment is not fully resolved. The contradiction on leakage treatment between the validation report and the later PDD also adds some reliability risk.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

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

- The record contains many corrective actions and a date mismatch between the validation report and a later PDD reference, which reduces confidence in documentation completeness.

Documentation quality is moderate rather than strong: fourteen documents were used and extraction confidence is medium, which avoids the lowest tier but still leaves some readability risk. The record includes several safeguards signals such as FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing, but it also contains multiple corrective actions and a documented mismatch between the registered PDD and onsite equipment. The crediting period is not stated, so recency and full project timeline clarity are limited.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No buffer or reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Zero deduction with negligible justification
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete monitoring package with verified emission reductions, usage monitoring method, and any baseline reassessment clearly documented.

→ Resolve the PDD-versus-implementation discrepancies and publish a clear explanation of the corrective actions and their impact on credited emissions.

Documents Reviewed

- Revision of the monitoring plan for leomax
- revised monitoring plan
- approval
- 16 Mar 2009 - 30 Nov 2009
- Appendix 2 - Notification
- registration request form
- 01 Dec 2009 - 31 Jan 2011
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- project design document
- Appendix 1 - Revised PDD Tracked Changes
- validation report of revised monitoring plan
- 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-7B577CE0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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