

## QUALITY REPORT

# Sichuan Rural Poor - Household Biogas Development Programme

GS-148 · Gold Standard · China

Report ID: CM-2D93599C · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.5**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.2</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.1</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.4</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a Gold Standard biogas avoidance project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage deduction, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record has material findings, missing key public-performance fields, and a date contradiction on the crediting period that reduces confidence in the documentation and claim safety.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-148
Sector	biogas
Country	China
Vintage	2016
Project Methodology	AMS-I.I. version 04
Crediting Period	2012 — 2025
VVB	Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd (CTI)
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

## Red Flags

- The verification report lists material findings and corrective actions, including CARs and a closed clarification, which indicates unresolved or previously unresolved issues in the audit trail.
- The crediting period differs between documents: the monitoring report shows 2012-04-11 to 2025-01-31, while the validation report shows 2019-04-11 to 2026-04-10; the monitoring report is more specific to the project's operational history, but the inconsistency still weakens reliability.
- Key claim-safety fields such as verified usage rate, total ERR claimed versus verified, and CORSIA/CCP status are not stated in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test, which is a meaningful positive for project integrity.
- The verification report records material findings and corrective actions, and the baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed jurisdictional baseline.

The verification report confirms additionality through a barrier test and names Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd. as the VVB, which supports the project's core environmental case. Leakage is not ignored: the record shows a quantified deduction of 10%. On the negative side, the verification report also lists material findings and corrective actions, and the baseline is described as project-based rather than a clearly standardized baseline, which keeps integrity below strong levels.

### Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + The project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and a documented annual survey approach for usage monitoring.
- Total emission reductions claimed versus verified are not stated, and the crediting-period inconsistency between documents reduces transparency.

Transparency is moderate because the record includes a monitoring period, a named verifier, and an annual survey method for usage monitoring. However, the extracted facts do not state total emission reductions claimed or verified, and several key public-facing performance fields are missing. The documentation is therefore usable but incomplete for a full independent check.

### Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + Leakage is at least quantified, with a 10% deduction and stated justification.
- Verified usage rates, FNRB inputs, and CORSIA/CCP eligibility are not stated, leaving over-crediting and dual-claim risk only partially assessed.

Claim safety is helped by the quantified 10% leakage deduction and the fact that this is an avoidance project, which generally lowers reversal risk. Still, the record does not state verified usage rates, FNRB values, or CORSIA/CCP status, so over-crediting and dual-claim risk cannot be tightly bounded. The project is certified under Gold Standard, but certification alone does not resolve the missing claim-safety inputs.

### Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + Multiple official document types were used, including validation, monitoring, and verification reports, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- Material findings were present, and the crediting-period contradiction shows that the documentary record is not fully consistent.

The evidence base is reasonably broad, with validation, monitoring, and verification documents all used, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low. Even so, the verification report contains material findings and corrective actions, which indicates the documentation required follow-up. The crediting-period contradiction between the monitoring report and validation report also weakens confidence in the record's completeness and consistency.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project with no reversal events stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified 10% deduction
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Grievance mechanism and safeguards noted, FPIC not stated
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified versus claimed emission reduction totals, along with the underlying calculation sheets and any reconciliation notes.

→ Clarify the crediting-period discrepancy and disclose CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, and verified usage-rate evidence from the monitoring survey.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report\_7th monitoring period\_01-01-2018 to 31-12-2018\_v2.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_5th monitoring period\_01-01-2016 to 31-12-2016\_v2.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_5th monitoring period\_01-01-2016 to 31-12-2016\_v2.1.pdf
- POA CDM 2898 GS1239-Transition-request-form-PoA.pdf
- 20210122 GS1239 POA-DD- CP renewal\_v3.4\_track.pdf
- GS1239-Deviation-Request-Form\_20210316\_Aproved.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1706
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1706
- Verification Report\_5th monitoring period\_01-01-2016 to 31-12-2016\_v01.pdf
- Verification Report\_7th monitoring period\_01-01-2018 to 31-12-2018\_v2.pdf
- Verification Report\_5th monitoring period\_01-01-2016 to 31-12-2016\_v2.pdf
- Validation Report\_POA-VAL\_v2.2\_GS1239-cl.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-2D93599C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10  
 carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy