QUALITY REPORT

Yuqing Rural Methane Digesters Project in Guizhou Province.

CM-d50101 · Gold Standard · China

Report ID: CM-FAB4656C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7 Overall Score out of 10		
	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.3
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This Gold Standard biogas project has decent documentation coverage (PDD, validation, and monitoring) and a clear monitoring period with verified ERs lower than claimed. However, key integrity elements are under-specified in the extracted record (baseline approach, additionality test, and leakage treatment), and there is a direct inconsistency on whether leakage was addressed.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CM-d50101
Sector	biogas
Country	China
Vintage	2018, 2019
Project Methodology	AMS-I.C., AMS-III.R. 19.0, 03.0
Crediting Period	2013 — 2023
Verified ERs	136,582 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the PDD indicates leakage was quantified, while the monitoring report states leakage was not addressed.
- ■ Additionality approach and baseline method were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in additionality and baseline robustness.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ No material findings or corrective actions were reported in the monitoring report (2021).

- Baseline approach, additionality test, and leakage deduction were not found in the extracted record, and leakage handling is inconsistent between the PDD (2015) and monitoring report (2021).

The monitoring report (2021) covers the 2017–2019 monitoring period and reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports procedural integrity. However, the extracted record does not include the baseline method or any baseline reassessment timing, and the additionality test type and whether the VVB confirmed additionality were not found. Leakage is a key weakness: the monitoring report (2021) indicates leakage was not addressed, and no leakage deduction value was found.

Transparency — 6.3 / 10

+ Both claimed and verified emission reductions are available (monitoring report, 2021).

- The VVB name and several key quantification inputs (e.g., baseline method, leakage deduction) were not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2021) provides both claimed and verified totals (150,207 claimed vs 136,582 verified) and specifies the usage monitoring method as an annual survey. At the same time, the VVB name was not found in the extracted record, and several quantification elements (baseline method, leakage deduction) are missing, reducing auditability from the extracted dataset. Public eligibility markers (CORSIA/CCP) were also not stated in available documents.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ Verified ERs (136,582) are materially lower than claimed (150,207), suggesting conservative verification outcomes (monitoring report, 2021).

- CORSIA and CCP status were not stated in available documents, and leakage treatment is contradictory, increasing over-crediting/claims risk.

Because verified ERs are lower than claimed (monitoring report, 2021), the issuance outcome appears to have been tightened through verification, which reduces over-crediting risk relative to self-reported claims. Nonetheless, leakage handling is unclear and contradictory across documents, and the extracted record does not show a leakage deduction or justification in the monitoring report (2021). CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not stated in available documents, so downstream claims risk cannot be screened out.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- Some critical fields were not found in the extracted record (e.g., VVB name, baseline method, additionality test type).

Three key document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting a solid documentation score. The monitoring report is relatively recent (dated 2021-12-11) and clearly states the monitoring period (2017–2019). However, important identifiers and decision-critical content were not found in the extracted record (e.g., VVB name, baseline method, additionality test type), indicating completeness gaps in the extracted facts.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Additionality test not found in extracted record
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
Leakage	Leakage inconsistently treated across documents
Baseline	Baseline method not found in extracted record
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated in available documents

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and/or extract the baseline approach and additionality demonstration from the validation/verification documentation, including explicit confirmation by the VVB.

→ Resolve leakage inconsistency by stating the applied leakage sources and any deduction (or justification for zero) in the monitoring/verification documentation for the 2017–2019 period.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification Report

Report ID: CM-FAB4656C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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