QUALITY REPORT

Guangzhou Zhujiang Beer Methane Recovery Project (300068)_pre-CDM VER

GS-1194 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-2A7AA3FE · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.8
Transparency (25%)	4.9
Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality, documented safeguards, and a quantified leakage treatment. However, the verification report also records several material inconsistencies and missing monitoring details, which weaken confidence in the emissions claim and the robustness of the MRV system.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1194
Sector	biogas
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-III.H Version 13
Crediting Period	2008 — 2009
VVB	CEPREI Certification Body
Monitoring Period	2008 — 2009
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- ■ The verification report lists multiple material findings, including incomplete meter calibration coverage, missing COD monitoring descriptions, and inconsistencies between the monitoring report and the registered PDD.
- ■ There is a contradiction on leakage treatment: the monitoring report says leakage was deemed negligible, while the verification report indicates a quantified approach; the later verification report is more reliable, but the inconsistency reduces confidence.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports the project’s baseline credibility.

- The verification report records several material findings, including calibration gaps, inconsistent methodology references, and unclear monitoring data handling.

The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test and identifies the project as a methane recovery activity under AMS-III.H, which is a positive sign for baseline logic. At the same time, the report lists several material findings, including meter calibration that did not cover the full monitoring period, inconsistent methodology references, and unclear parameter treatment, all of which weaken confidence in the emissions integrity. Reversal risk is not well addressed because reversal events are noted as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is stated.

Transparency — 4.9 / 10

+ The project has three core documents available, and the verification report names CEPREI Certification Body as the VVB.

- The monitoring record shows missing or incomplete reporting on COD data, meter installation, and some monitored NOx values, which weakens MRV transparency.

The project has a verification report, monitoring report, and PDD, and the VVB is identified as CEPREI Certification Body, which supports basic traceability. However, the monitoring documentation contains missing descriptions for COD data generation and monitoring locations, and some monitored NOx values were not fully included in the report. The absence of a stated usage monitoring method also limits transparency around how the claimed reductions were derived.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

+ Leakage is treated as quantified in the verification report, and the project is not presented as CCP-approved.

- The record contains contradictions on leakage treatment and crediting period, and CORSIA eligibility is not stated, leaving some claim-risk uncertainty.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a recognized methodology and the verification report indicates quantified leakage treatment rather than an unexamined assumption. Still, the record contains a contradiction on leakage, with the monitoring report describing leakage as negligible while the verification report indicates a quantified approach; I privileged the verification report because it is later and more authoritative for assurance. CORSIA eligibility is not stated and CCP status is not mentioned, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ The evidence set includes a verification report, monitoring report, and PDD, with high extraction confidence.

- The verification report identifies multiple documentation gaps and inconsistencies, including missing monitoring diagrams and mismatched methodology references.

Documentation is reasonably broad because three official documents were used and extraction confidence is high. Even so, the verification report itself highlights several documentation weaknesses, including incomplete calibration coverage, missing monitoring diagrams, and inconsistent statements between the monitoring report and the registered PDD. The crediting period in the PDD also differs from the monitoring period in the verification record, which suggests the documentation set is not fully aligned.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No buffer pool stated
Leakage	Quantified but inconsistent treatment
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CCP/CORSIA status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, reconciled monitoring package showing meter calibration coverage, COD data handling, and all monitored values used in the issuance calculation.

→ Clarify leakage treatment, crediting-period alignment, and registry/eligibility status to reduce claim and double-counting uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_20-12-08 to 19-12-09_v2.2.pdf
- PDD_21-08-09.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1194
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1194
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_20-12-08 to 19-12-09_v2.1.pdf

Report ID: CM-2A7AA3FE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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