

QUALITY REPORT

Biomass generation project, in Sheyang county, Jiangsu...

CNN-6df5a5 · Gold Standard · China

Report ID: CM-14712A30 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This biomass grid-electricity project shows a reasonably robust additionality case (investment test confirmed by the VVB), but baseline and leakage treatment are not consistently documented across reports. Safeguards and stakeholder protections appear weak (no FPIC, no grievance mechanism found), and there is a material inconsistency in verified ER figures across monitoring reports that increases over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-6df5a5
Sector	biomass
Country	China
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Project Methodology	ACM0006 04
Crediting Period	2008 — 2015
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Verified ERs	308,901 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2015
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	16 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Verified ERs conflict across monitoring reports (308,901 vs 405,219), raising data reliability and over-crediting concerns.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent between validation (quantified) and later monitoring (deemed negligible), with no clear reconciliation.
- Safeguards are weak: FPIC not conducted and no grievance mechanism found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (Bureau Veritas Certification).

- Leakage and baseline robustness are weakened by missing/unclear reassessment timing and inconsistent leakage treatment across documents.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation/verification record indicates an investment test and that additionality was confirmed by Bureau Veritas Certification. Baseline setting is project-specific (per the extracted record) and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens confidence in baseline validity over time. Leakage is not consistently treated: the monitoring report (2022-07-02) deems leakage negligible, while the validation report (2008-03-20) indicates leakage was quantified, and no leakage deduction percentage is found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, financial) and a named VVB is identified.

- Key MRV elements are incomplete or inconsistent (e.g., conflicting verified ER totals; grid EF vintage not stated in the extracted record).

The extracted record identifies the VVB (Bureau Veritas Certification) and provides a clear monitoring period (2013-01-01 to 2015-03-31) and crediting period (2008-04-01 to 2015-03-31). However, transparency is reduced by inconsistent reporting of verified emission reductions across monitoring reports and by missing MRV specifics such as the grid emission factor vintage year and any usage monitoring method. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the available extracted record, which is positive but does not resolve the numeric inconsistencies.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing some double-claiming/eligibility-related marketing risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by conflicting verified ER totals and unclear leakage quantification in later monitoring.

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of CORSIA-related double-claiming narratives. Claim safety is nonetheless constrained by over-crediting risk signals: the monitoring report (2022-07-02) shows verified ERs of 308,901 while an earlier monitoring report (2011-01-19) shows 405,219, and the project also shows a gap between claimed (334,055) and verified (308,901) ERs in the 2022 monitoring report. Leakage treatment inconsistency (quantified in the 2008 validation report vs deemed negligible in the 2022 monitoring report) further increases uncertainty around net climate benefit claims.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ Document set is relatively complete (11 documents used) and includes validation and monitoring materials with a named VVB.

- Extraction confidence is only medium and some key fields are not found (e.g., baseline reassessment date, leakage deduction, buffer/reversal details).

Documentation coverage is moderate-to-good: the evidence list includes a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and financial documentation, and 11 documents were used in extraction. The minimum extraction confidence is medium, implying some limitations in readability or extraction quality that should temper reliance on specific figures. Several important items are not found in the extracted record (baseline reassessment date, leakage deduction percentage, buffer pool percentage, and any reversal event details), reducing completeness for a full quality assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● Permanence	No reversal risk indicated for grid electricity project
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent; deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism not evidenced
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear reconciliation note explaining the difference in verified ER totals between the 2011 and 2022 monitoring reports, including any restatements, boundary changes, or methodology updates.

→ Disclose leakage quantification (or a justified 0% deduction) consistently across monitoring, including the leakage deduction percentage and supporting calculations.

→ Strengthen and document safeguards: implement a grievance mechanism and document stakeholder engagement/FPIC (or an equivalent process) consistent with Gold Standard expectations.

Documents Reviewed

- revised monitoring plan
- approval
- authorization
- 01 Jan 2013 - 31 Mar 2015
- 01 Sep 2010 - 31 Dec 2012
- 01 Apr 2008 - 31 Aug 2010
- Appendix 2 - IRR and ERy_Sheyang_ref.1366
- registration request form
- Appendix 1 - Revised_PDD_Sheyang_ref.1366_Tracked
- project design document
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- Validation report
- validation report of revised monitoring plan

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-14712A30 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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