QUALITY REPORT

Cooking With Gas

CE-sichuan-china · Gold Standard · China

Report ID: CM-66ED7B52 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.4
	Transparency (25%)	6.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This Gold Standard biogas programme shows some integrity strengths, notably VVB-confirmed additionality and documented social safeguards (FPIC and a grievance mechanism). However, key climate-accounting elements are weakly evidenced in the extracted record, especially leakage treatment and baseline parameters, and there is a material inconsistency on whether leakage was quantified.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CE-sichuan-china
Sector	biogas
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.I., AMS-III.R. version 04, version 02
Crediting Period	2012 — 2023
VVB	Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd (CTI)
Verified ERs	822,520 tCO_2e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (one record says leakage was not addressed, another indicates it was quantified).
- ■ Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record.
- ■ A sizable gap exists between claimed and verified ERs (876,123 claimed vs 822,520 verified) without an extracted explanation.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report (2019) and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation/verification record indicates a barrier test and that additionality was confirmed by the VVB. Baseline setting is weaker because the extracted record indicates a project-specific baseline approach and does not state when (or whether) the baseline was last reassessed. Leakage is a key integrity gap: the monitoring report (2019) indicates leakage was not addressed, and no leakage deduction is found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2019) provides a clear monitoring period (2018-01-01 to 2018-12-31) and identifies the VVB (CTI).

- Key quantification inputs (e.g., grid emission factor, leakage deduction) are not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV traceability.

The monitoring report (dated 2019-09-04) clearly states the monitoring period (2018-01-01 to 2018-12-31) and names the VVB as Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd (CTI). The project reports both claimed and verified ERs (876,123 claimed vs 822,520 verified), which supports transparency on outcomes, but the extracted record does not provide key calculation inputs such as the grid emission factor or any leakage deduction. Usage monitoring is described as annual surveys, but no verified usage rate is found in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by unclear leakage handling and missing baseline parameters in the extracted record.

~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.

Claim safety is constrained by missing or inconsistent climate-accounting elements: leakage is shown as not addressed in the monitoring report (2019), and baseline parameters like the grid emission factor are not found in the extracted record. The difference between claimed and verified ERs (876,123 vs 822,520) suggests adjustments occurred, but without extracted detail this increases perceived over-crediting risk. CCP status and CORSIA eligibility are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily rely on these labels for low-greenwashing claims.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Multiple core documents were used (monitoring report, validation report, plus one additional source) with high extraction confidence.

- One evidence source is labeled as unknown and a key contradiction exists, reducing confidence in completeness/consistency.

Documentation coverage is moderate: three documents were used (monitoring report, validation report, and one additional source labeled unknown) and extraction confidence is high. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which supports procedural completeness. However, the presence of an unknown source document and a substantive contradiction on leakage treatment reduce confidence in the record’s internal consistency.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
Permanence	Avoidance project; reversal/buffer not evidenced
Leakage	Inconsistent and not clearly treated
Baseline	Project-specific; reassessment not evidenced
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the specific leakage assessment for the monitored period, including whether leakage was quantified and any applied deduction, and reconcile the discrepancy across documents.

→ Disclose key baseline parameters (e.g., grid emission factor and its vintage) and document when the baseline was last reassessed under the applied methodology versions.

Documents Reviewed

- 2018 Monitoring Report
- 2018 - Sichuan Biogas PoA
- 2018 Verification Report

Report ID: CM-66ED7B52 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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