

QUALITY REPORT

Biogas utilization project in Zhejiang Jingxing Paper Joint Stock Co. Ltd.. (300660)

GS-1234 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-A236938D · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| ■ Integrity (35%) | 4.8 |
| ■ Transparency (25%) | 4.2 |
| ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 4.5 |
| ■ Documentation (15%) | 5.1 |

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a named verifier, but the evidence base is uneven. The verification report also shows multiple corrective action and clarification requests, and key items such as leakage treatment, usage monitoring, and verified emission reductions are not fully documented in the extracted record.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Registry | Gold Standard |
| Registry ID | GS-1234 |
| Sector | biogas |
| Country | China |
| Vintage | Stale |
| Project Methodology | AMS-III.H Version 15 |
| Crediting Period | 2011 — 2021 |
| VVB | TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd. |
| Monitoring Period | 2011 — 2012 |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 12 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-13 |

Red Flags

- The verification report lists 6 corrective action requests and 4 clarification requests, indicating notable documentation and implementation issues.
- Leakage is described as not addressed in the verification report, while the monitoring report reportedly treated it as negligible, creating a reliability concern.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd. in the verification report using an investment test.
- Leakage justification is not addressed in the verification report, and the record shows multiple corrective actions and clarifications.

The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test and names TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd. as the VVB, which supports the project's core integrity case. However, leakage is not addressed in the verification report, reversal events are not addressed, and the report records 6 corrective action requests plus 4 clarification requests, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the crediting case.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period in the verification report.
- Verified and claimed emission reduction totals are not stated in the extracted record, and the usage monitoring method is also not found.

Transparency is limited by missing quantified outputs in the extracted record: verified and claimed emission reductions are not stated, and the usage monitoring method is not found. On the positive side, the monitoring period is clearly identified and the verifier is named, but the overall MRV picture remains incomplete.

Claim Safety — 4.5 / 10

- + The project uses an established CDM methodology, AMS-III.H, which supports some methodological structure.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is moderate at best because the project relies on a project-specific baseline rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and the leakage treatment is inconsistent. The monitoring report reportedly described leakage as negligible, but the verification report says it was not addressed, so the safer reading is to discount confidence in the claim quality.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were available, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and verification report.
- The verification report shows many corrective action and clarification requests, and one key document was listed as unknown in the extracted set.

Documentation is mixed: the record includes multiple official documents and the extraction confidence is high, which helps. Still, the verification report contains many corrective actions and clarifications, and the extracted set includes an unknown document entry, so the file is not fully clean or complete.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| ● Additionality | VVB-confirmed investment test |
| ● Permanence | No reversal treatment stated |
| ● Leakage | Inconsistent leakage treatment |
| ● Baseline | Project-specific baseline |
| ● Safeguards | FPIC and grievance mechanism present |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA-eligible status only |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and reconcile the monitoring report and verification report treatment of leakage.

→ Publish the verified emission reduction totals, usage monitoring method, and a cleaner resolution of the corrective action and clarification requests.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_28-07-2011 to 31-08-2012.pdf
- GS Passport_09-04-2012.pdf
- GS Passport..pdf
- GS Passport.pdf
- (1)PDD 07.05.2010_v2.pdf
- PDD _13-07-2011.pdf
- PDD 07.05.2010_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1234
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1234
- GS Validation Report 25.04.2012_v4.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_28-07-2011 to 31-08-2012.pdf
- GS Validation Report 29.12.2011_v3.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-A236938D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy