

QUALITY REPORT

Biogas Digesters and Clean Cookstoves

CE-biogas-digesters-and · CDM · China

Report ID: CM-E5723C3F · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.5
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation beyond basic metadata, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high due to lack of evidence rather than confirmed flaws.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CE-biogas-digesters-and
Sector	cookstoves
Country	China
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any corrective actions were not found in the extracted record
- ~ CDM cookstove/biogas activities can be credible, but no evidence was provided to assess this project

No validation/verification, monitoring, or PDD content was available in the extracted record (no evidence documents listed), so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions cannot be confirmed. Because these are core integrity elements for cookstove/biogas projects, the score is heavily penalized for evidence gaps. Low extraction confidence further increases the chance that any conclusions would be unreliable.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or error checks were found in the extracted record
- Registry/public reporting completeness cannot be assessed because no source documents were captured

The extracted record contains no VVB identity, monitoring period, or quantified monitoring/verification results, so MRV transparency cannot be evaluated. With no documents captured, there is no way to check consistency between claimed and verified emission reductions or to assess registry completeness. Transparency is therefore scored very low due to absence of accessible evidence.

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record
- ~ Over-crediting risk cannot be bounded because baseline and usage monitoring details were not provided

No information was found on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, baseline parameters, or usage monitoring methods, all of which are important to assess over-crediting and greenwashing risk for cookstove/biogas activities. In the absence of documentation, claims based on this project would be difficult to substantiate and carry elevated reputational risk. The score reflects uncertainty and inability to demonstrate conservative accounting.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero evidence documents were captured/used, so the assessment cannot be evidenced
- Extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability of at least one key document

The extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence list, indicating the underlying project documentation was not available to the extraction process. The minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key document was poorly readable, which further undermines reliability. This triggers a very low documentation score (note: a documentation score below 3.0 would cap transparency under the stated gate rules).

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	No baseline method found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the PDD, validation report, and latest monitoring/verification reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be assessed and cross-checked
- Publish/confirm registry details (issuance, monitoring periods, VVB identity) and disclose usage monitoring and any leakage assumptions/deductions to reduce over-crediting risk

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-E5723C3F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy