

QUALITY REPORT

*Suzhou Qizi Mountain Landfill Gas Recovery Project (300259)

GS-1643 · Gold Standard · China

Report ID: CM-20DA4B38 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This landfill gas recovery project has some strong quality signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a named verifier, and CCP approval. However, the verification report also shows multiple corrective actions and a conservative but not ideal emissions calculation approach, while leakage and reversal treatment are not clearly addressed in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1643
Sector	methane
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0001 version 16.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
VVB	LGAi Technological Center, S.A.
Verified ERs	317,242 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	27 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- The verification report records multiple corrective actions and clarifications, including meter calibration issues and a request for future ER calculations using credible monitored data.
- Leakage and reversal treatment are not clearly documented in the extracted facts, and the project relies on a project-specific baseline rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test in the verification report.

- The verification report notes several CARs/CLs and says the ER method is conservative but not ideal because it is not based on directly monitored LFG parameters.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and names LGAI Technological Center, S.A. as the verifier, which supports the project's core integrity. At the same time, the report lists multiple CARs and CLs, and it explicitly says the ER calculation method is conservative but not ideal because it is not based on directly monitored LFG parameters. Leakage is not addressed in the extracted facts, and reversal treatment is also not clearly documented.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ The monitoring period, verifier name, verified ER volume, and Gold Standard registry information are stated in the verification report.

- The extracted record does not state the leakage deduction, usage monitoring method, or total claimed ERs, limiting traceability.

The documentation identifies the monitoring period, the verified emissions reductions of 317,242, the registry, and the verifier, which is helpful for traceability. However, key MRV details are missing from the extracted record, including the leakage deduction, usage monitoring method, and claimed ER total. The medium extraction confidence also suggests the record is usable but not fully complete.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is CCP approved, which supports stronger market credibility.

- Leakage is marked as not addressed, and the baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or jurisdictionally reassessed baseline.

Claim safety is helped by CCP approval and by the fact that the project is a landfill gas recovery activity, which is generally easier to justify than many nature-based credit types. Still, the baseline is project-specific, leakage is not addressed, and the record does not show a quantified leakage deduction or a clearly documented usage-rate check. Those gaps increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types were used, including the PDD, verification report, monitoring report, and appendix, with medium extraction confidence.

- The verification report contains several corrective actions and a calibration discrepancy that had to be corrected in a revised monitoring report.

The record draws on 23 extracted items across several document types, including the verification report, PDD, monitoring report, and appendix, which is a reasonable documentation base. The verifier is independent and the report is recent, but the extraction confidence is only medium and the report contains several corrective actions, including a meter calibration correction. That lowers confidence in the completeness and cleanliness of the documentation trail.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CCP approved; CORSIA status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear leakage assessment with a quantified deduction or a documented justification for why leakage is negligible.

→ Publish a fuller MRV package showing the usage monitoring method, claimed versus verified ERs, and the basis for the emissions calculation using directly monitored data.

Documents Reviewed

- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form GS397_02_DEV_534.pdf
- Monitoring-Report-7th_v3-clean.pdf
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form GS397_01_DEV_531(1).pdf
- 2nd Annual report_Suzhou LFG_GS397.pdf
- ER_Suzhou(GS397)_8th_v1.1.xlsx
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01-08-10 to 31-12-11-v7.0.pdf
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form GS397_02(1).docx
- Annual report of Suzhou LFG(GS397)_2023.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01-08-10 to 31-12-11_v7.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_22-04-07 to 31-07-09_v2.0.pdf
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form GS397_01(1).docx
- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01-01-2012 to 31-12-2013_v3.0.pdf
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form GS397_01_DEV_531.pdf
- Suzhou_Monitoring-Report-3rd_2CP-01082020-21042021-clean.pdf
- Suzhou_Monitoring-Report-1st_3CP-22042021-30042022-clean.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-08-09 to 31-07-10_v3.0.pdf
- GS397 Suzhou Annual report Suzhou LFG_2022.pdf
- Transition-Annex-Suzhou_GS397_clean.pdf
- GS4GG VR Renewal of the Crediting Period - Suzhou Qizi Mountain Landfill Gas Recovery Project - track.pdf
- PDD_21-12-2015.pdf
- Renewal PDD_GS397_Suzhou LFG_V4_clean.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1643
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1643
- GS 397_Suzhou LFG_7th MP_FVR_20210118_approved.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01-08-10 to 31-12-11_v1.1.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01-08-10 to 31-12-11-v1.1.pdf
- A SH_SYST_10722 Gs Verification Report-3rd_2CP-clean.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-20DA4B38 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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