

## QUALITY REPORT

# Tieqilishi AWMS GHG Mitigation Project in Sichuan Province

GS-3644 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-684DC177 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 5.1

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, no reported reversal events in the extracted record, and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, several key items are missing or unclear, especially leakage treatment, baseline reassessment, and usage monitoring details, which limits confidence in the claimed climate benefits.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3644
Sector	biogas
Country	China
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC Version 3.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2024
VVB	Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd (CTI)
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

## Red Flags

- Fourteen corrective action requests and five clarification requests indicate notable documentation or implementation issues.
- Leakage treatment, buffer pool coverage, and several monitoring inputs are not stated in the available documents.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under the Gold Standard TPDDTEC methodology.

- Leakage deduction, buffer pool percentage, and baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the available documents.

The project benefits from VVB-confirmed additionality and a combined additionality test under TPDDTEC Version 3.0, which supports the core project rationale. At the same time, leakage deduction, buffer pool coverage, and baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the available documents, so the integrity case is only moderate. No reversal events are reported in the extracted record, but the reversal field is also described as not addressed in one source, so permanence evidence is not fully clean.

### Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period is stated as 2024-01-01 to 2024-12-31, and the VVB is identified as Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd.

- Total emissions reductions claimed versus verified are not found in the extracted record, and usage monitoring details are not provided.

The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the VVB is named as Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd., which helps traceability. However, the extracted record does not provide total emissions reductions claimed versus verified, and key MRV details such as usage monitoring method are missing. The absence of FNRB and grid-factor details further limits public-facing transparency around the calculation basis.

### Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

+ The project has no reported reversal events in the extracted record, which reduces permanence-related claim risk for this avoidance-style activity.

- Baseline method is only described as project-specific, while leakage justification, FNRB information, and usage-rate evidence are not stated.

Claim safety is weakened by missing evidence on leakage, usage rates, and FNRB, all of which are important for assessing over-crediting risk in biogas electricity projects. The baseline is described only as project-specific, rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, which adds uncertainty. On the positive side, no reversal events are reported, and there is no evidence in the extracted record of double registration or dual issuance.

### Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ The record includes multiple evidence sources, including the PDD and monitoring report, and the project has documented FPIC, grievance, and benefit-sharing elements.

- Fourteen CARs and five CLs were issued, and one key document was poorly readable, which lowers confidence in the completeness of the file.

The file draws on multiple document types, including the PDD and monitoring report, and it includes safeguards such as FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and benefit-sharing. Still, the presence of 14 corrective action requests and 5 clarification requests suggests material documentation issues. The minimum extraction confidence is medium rather than high, so the documentation score is held back by incomplete readability and missing quantified fields.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal events reported, but not fully addressed
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not stated
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified emissions figures, leakage treatment, and usage monitoring methodology for the monitoring period.

→ Resolve the crediting-period and reversal-events inconsistencies with a clear, dated statement in the latest verification or monitoring package.

## Documents Reviewed

- Annual Report-GS 11712-Sichuan.docx
- SDG-Impact-Tool-1st-V02.xlsx
- ER-Tieqilishi\_Sichuan-1st-V01-final.xlsx
- MR-Tieqilishi\_Sichuan-1st-V03-clean-final(1).docx
- 20230718\_GS4GG Final VER Report\_Tieqilishi Sichuan 1st\_clean(1).pdf
- Draft SCR-Tieqilishi Sichuan -Version 01.docx
- ER-Tieqilishi Sichuan-V02-clean.xlsx
- 20230718\_GS4GG Final VAL Report\_Tieqilishi Sichuan\_clean(1).pdf
- SDG-Impact-Tool-Tieqilishi Sichuan(1).xlsx
- PDD-Tieqilishi Sichuan\_V03-clean.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3644
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3644

### 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-684DC177 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy