QUALITY REPORT

Hebei ChengAn Biomass Cogeneration Project

CNN-b757e9 · Gold Standard · China

Report ID: CM-277C1B1F · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.0
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
	Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some integrity strengths because additionality is confirmed by the VVB and no material findings or corrective actions are reported. However, key quantifications that affect credit robustness (notably leakage deduction and verified ERs) are missing from the extracted record, and there are document-to-document inconsistencies on leakage treatment and the crediting period.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-b757e9
Sector	biomass
Country	China
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Project Methodology	ACM0006 09
Crediting Period	2010 — 2017
VVB	Det Norske Veritas
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (validation report says leakage was quantified, while the monitoring report deems leakage negligible), but no leakage deduction value is available in the extracted record.
- ■ Crediting period dates conflict between the validation report and the monitoring report, raising reliability concerns for period boundaries and issuance alignment.
- ■ Verified emission reductions are not available in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess over-crediting risk.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

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

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation/verification record indicates an investment test and that additionality was confirmed by the VVB (validation report, 2010). Baseline setting is weaker because the baseline is project-specific and the date of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents. Leakage is a material uncertainty: the monitoring report (2022) deems leakage negligible, while the validation report (2010) indicates leakage was quantified, but the actual leakage deduction is not found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ A named VVB (Det Norske Veritas) and a clearly stated monitoring period are provided in the monitoring report (2022).

- Key MRV outputs (claimed and verified ER totals, leakage deduction, usage monitoring method) are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is moderate: the monitoring report (2022) provides a clear monitoring period (2010-12-05 to 2017-12-04) and identifies the VVB as Det Norske Veritas. However, the extracted record does not include total emission reductions claimed or verified, nor the monitoring approach for any end-use/usage parameters, limiting independent scrutiny. The lack of a stated grid emission factor and year in the extracted record further reduces traceability for baseline calculations under ACM0006.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Leakage and period-boundary contradictions increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk because the basis for credited quantities is unclear.

Claim safety benefits from the project being explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of overlapping aviation-related claims (monitoring report, 2022). Still, over-crediting risk cannot be well bounded because verified ER totals are not found in the extracted record and leakage treatment is inconsistent between the validation report (2010) and monitoring report (2022). CCP status is not stated in available documents, leaving uncertainty about how the credits may be marketed and perceived.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ Two core documents are available (validation report and monitoring report) with high extraction confidence and no reported material findings/corrective actions.

- Safeguards elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are absent or not documented in the extracted record.

Documentation quality is fair: two key document types are present (validation report and monitoring report) and extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report (2022) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports procedural completeness. Social safeguard documentation appears weak in the extracted record, with FPIC not conducted and no grievance mechanism or benefit-sharing description found.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No buffer/reversal info found
Leakage	Inconsistent leakage treatment
Baseline	Project-specific; reassessment not stated
Safeguards	FPIC/grievance not evidenced
Double-claim	Not CORSIA; CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the quantified leakage assessment and any applied leakage deduction (or a clear justification for 0%) consistent across validation and monitoring documentation.

→ Disclose claimed vs verified emission reductions for the monitoring period and the key calculation inputs (e.g., grid emission factor and year) to enable independent replication.

→ Clarify and reconcile the official crediting period dates across documents and registry records, including start/end dates and any renewals.

Documents Reviewed

- approval
- 05 Dec 2010 - 04 Dec 2017
- registration request form
- Appendix 2 - Financial_Analysis
- Appendix 1 - EF_ER_Calc
- project design document
- Validation report

Report ID: CM-277C1B1F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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