

QUALITY REPORT

Biomass Power Generation Project by Everbright Alternative Energy (Dangshan) Limited

GS-336 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-B8794AB5 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, safeguards were documented, and the verification report shows corrective actions were taken after monitoring gaps were identified. However, the record also shows weak leakage treatment, a project-specific baseline, and several documentation issues that reduce confidence in the claimed environmental performance.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-336
Sector	biomass
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0018 ver.02.0.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2018
VVB	TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- The verification report says leakage was not addressed, while the monitoring report described it as negligible; this inconsistency weakens reliability.
- The verification report identified missing or unclear monitoring evidence for air, water, soil, pollutants, and employment, indicating incomplete MRV at first pass.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which supports the project's core eligibility case.
- Leakage treatment is weak because the verification report says it was not addressed, even though the monitoring report later called it negligible.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and shows the project was reviewed by TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program. On the downside, the baseline is project-based and only noted as last reassessed in 2012, which is not especially strong for robustness. Leakage is a material weakness: the verification report says it was not addressed, while the monitoring report later described it as negligible, so the evidence is mixed and conservative scoring is warranted.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The verification report names TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program and the monitoring period is clearly stated as 2012-04-01 to 2013-03-31.
- Total ERs claimed and verified are not stated in the extracted record, and several monitoring parameters were initially unsupported by actual data.

The monitoring period is clearly stated and the VVB is identified, which helps traceability. However, the extracted record does not state total ERs claimed or verified, and several monitoring parameters were initially missing actual data in the verification report. The corrective actions later filled some of those gaps, but the record still reflects uneven disclosure quality.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project uses ACM0018 under Gold Standard, and the verification report indicates additionality was checked by the VVB.
- The baseline is project-specific and was last reassessed in 2012, while leakage handling remains inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is moderate because the project sits under a recognized methodology and additionality was VVB-confirmed. Still, the project-specific baseline and the leakage inconsistency create over-crediting risk. No CORSIA or CCP status is stated in the extracted record, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available evidence.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + Four evidence documents were used, and the extraction confidence is high, which supports a reasonably complete record.
- The verification report lists multiple material findings, showing that the original monitoring package had gaps before corrective actions were added.

Documentation is fair but not strong: four documents were used and extraction confidence is high, which supports reliability. At the same time, the verification report lists several material findings about missing or unclear monitoring evidence, showing that the original documentation package was incomplete before revisions. The crediting period extends beyond the stated monitoring period, but the record does not provide enough detail to fully assess recency and completeness across all claims.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage inconsistency; not addressed in verification
● Baseline	Project baseline; reassessment timing limited
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a fully reconciled leakage assessment with a quantified deduction or a clear, document-backed justification across all reports.

→ Disclose the total ERs claimed and verified, plus a complete monitoring table for all parameters with source-linked evidence.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01-04-12 to 31-03-13_v1.0.pdf
- GS Passport_24-12-13.pdf
- PDD_23-09-13.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-336
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-336
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01-04-12 to 31-03-13_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-B8794AB5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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