

QUALITY REPORT

# BRT Zhengzhou, China

CNN-b8e468 · Gold Standard · China

Report ID: CM-7E451D09 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>2.8</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>2.6</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>3.2</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>2.4</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>3.4</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, core carbon-accounting elements (baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, and verified ERs) are not available, making it hard to judge whether credits are conservatively quantified. Safeguards are partially evidenced (a grievance mechanism is indicated), but multiple corrective actions around stakeholder consultation and start-date checks raise reliability concerns.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-b8e468
Sector	other
Country	China
Vintage	2008, 2012
Project Methodology	AMS-III.F. v12
Crediting Period	2024 — 2029
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No verified or claimed emission reductions were found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess over-crediting risk.
- Additionality and baseline approach are not stated in available documents, despite being central to an avoidance project.
- Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) is not stated in available documents.
- Crediting period dates conflict across documents, indicating record inconsistency.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.6 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, and leakage treatment are not stated in available documents (only the methodology AMS-III.F. v12 is identified).

- Corrective actions in the stakeholder consultation record require the VVB to verify the project start date and stakeholder process, suggesting unresolved issues at the time of documentation.

The extracted record does not include an additionality test type or confirmation by the VVB, so additionality robustness cannot be assessed from available documents. The baseline approach is also not stated, even though the methodology is identified as AMS-III.F. v12, and there is no baseline reassessment date in the extracted record. Leakage is not quantified and no leakage justification is provided in the extracted record, which is a major integrity gap for an avoidance project. The stakeholder consultation document (2024-08-10) lists corrective actions requiring the VVB to check the start date and stakeholder consultation compliance, which increases uncertainty about key eligibility conditions.

### Transparency — 3.2 / 10

+ No material findings are reported in the extracted record.

- Key MRV fields (monitoring period, VVB name, and verified ERs) are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record lacks the VVB name, monitoring period, and any claimed versus verified emission reduction totals. While the extracted record shows no material findings, it also does not provide the underlying monitoring/verification data needed to independently evaluate performance. The evidence set includes an issuance record and a stakeholder consultation record, but the core MRV fields are not found in the extracted record.

### Claim Safety — 2.4 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline, leakage, and verified ER quantities are not available in the extracted record.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unclear.

Claim safety is weak because the extracted record does not provide verified ERs, baseline parameters, or leakage deductions, preventing a basic check for over-crediting. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess eligibility-related reputational risk or potential double-claim concerns. The presence of corrective actions in the stakeholder consultation record (2024-08-10) also suggests the project documentation may not have been fully settled at the time of review.

### Documentation — 3.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are referenced (issuance, stakeholder consultation, and another document), with medium extraction confidence.

- The extracted record appears internally inconsistent (project name mismatch and a crediting-period contradiction), and several corrective actions remain open.

Documentation completeness is mixed: several documents are referenced (including issuance and stakeholder consultation), and extraction confidence is medium rather than low. However, many critical fields are missing from the extracted record (VVB identity, monitoring period, ER quantities, baseline and leakage details). The stakeholder consultation document (2024-08-10) includes multiple corrective actions, indicating unresolved documentation/process issues. Additionally, the extracted project name does not match the user-provided project context, which raises concerns about document-to-project linkage in the extracted record.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	Additionality not evidenced
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project (no reversal buffer indicated)
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline approach not evidenced
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards partially documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verification/monitoring report(s) stating the monitoring period, VVB name, and claimed vs verified emission reductions, including any adjustments.

→ Disclose the baseline scenario and parameters used under AMS-III.F. v12, including when the baseline was last reassessed and how baseline emissions were calculated.

→ Publish leakage assessment and any leakage deduction (or a clear justification for negligible leakage) consistent with the methodology and project context.

## Documents Reviewed

- Stakeholder-Consultation-Report\_anonymised\_26072024.pdf
- GS 12908 Preliminary-review-request approved.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4744
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4744

### 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-7E451D09 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)