

QUALITY REPORT

Biogas Tanks in Guizhou Province in China

GS-1081 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-D49C7FA2 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| ■ Integrity (35%) | 5.2 |
| ■ Transparency (25%) | 5.6 |
| ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 4.8 |
| ■ Documentation (15%) | 6.1 |

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported in the verification report. However, key risk areas are weakly documented: leakage is not addressed, reversal handling is inconsistent, and the project uses a project-specific baseline that was last reassessed in 2008. Overall, the evidence supports a moderate but not high-confidence assessment.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Registry | Gold Standard |
| Registry ID | GS-1081 |
| Sector | biogas |
| Country | China |
| Vintage | Stale |
| Project Methodology | Gold Standard biodigester methodology Version 01 |
| Crediting Period | 2008 — 2018 |
| VVB | The Gold Standard Foundation |
| Verified ERs | 2,977 tCO ₂ e |
| Monitoring Period | 2012 — 2014 |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 14 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-15 |

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed and no deduction is stated in the available documents.
- The record contains contradictions on reversal events and on the verified emission reductions, which weakens reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the verification report reports no material findings.

- Leakage justification is not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and a broken biodigester was diagnosed in May 2013 without clear reversal treatment.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and says there were no material findings, which supports the project's core integrity. At the same time, leakage is not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and the report notes a broken biodigester diagnosed in May 2013 without a clear reversal resolution. The project also relies on a project baseline last reassessed in 2008, which is dated and weakens confidence in baseline validity.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period from 2012-04-01 to 2014-03-31, and matching claimed and verified reductions of 2,977 tCO₂e in the 2013 verification report.

~ Monitoring of usage relies on self-reporting, and the usage rate itself is not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency is moderate because the record includes a named verifier, a clear monitoring period, and a verification report with claimed and verified reductions both shown as 2,977. However, usage monitoring is based on self-reporting, the usage rate is not stated, and leakage treatment is missing. The documentation is therefore usable but not especially robust.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- The baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, and the last reassessment is only stated as 2008.

~ Leakage is not quantified, and the record does not state whether the project is CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved.

Claim safety is weakened by the project-specific baseline and the absence of quantified leakage treatment. The record does not provide enough information on usage rates or eligibility status to rule out over-crediting or dual-claim concerns. The matching claimed and verified reductions help, but the contradictions in the extracted record reduce confidence.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ Three document types were used, with 12 extracted facts and medium extraction confidence.

- The monitoring and verification record leaves several fields unstated, including buffer pool coverage, leakage treatment, and usage-rate verification.

The evidence base is broader than minimal, with a PDD, verification report, and monitoring report all used, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low. Still, several important items are not stated in available documents, including buffer pool coverage, leakage deduction, and verified usage rate. That leaves the documentation adequate but incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| ● Additionality | VVB-confirmed additionality |
| ● Permanence | reversal issue not clearly resolved |
| ● Leakage | leakage not addressed |
| ● Baseline | project baseline, reassessment dated 2008 |
| ● Safeguards | FPIC and grievance mechanism documented |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA/CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a quantified leakage assessment and explain why leakage is negligible or how it is deducted.

→ Clarify reversal handling and update the baseline reassessment with a more recent, documented review.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_5th monitoring period_01-04-12 to 31-03-14_v3.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01-04-10 to 31-03-11_v3.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01-04-08 to 31-03-09_v4.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-04-09 to 31-03-10_v3.0.doc
- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01-04-11 to 31-03-12_v2.0.pdf
- PDD 27.01.2009_v2.pdf
- GS6164 PDD Monitoring Plan.pdf
- PDD 25.11.2009_v4.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1081
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1081
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01-04-08 to 31-03-09_v3.1.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01-04-10 to 31-03-11_v1.0.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-04-09 to 31-03-10_v1.0.pdf
- Verification Report_4th monitoring period_01-04-11 to 31-03-12_v1.0.pdf

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-D49C7FA2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy