


QUALITY REPORT

Anhui Guzhen Biomass Generation Project

VCS-1121 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-09E26A08 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

The project has some solid integrity signals, including a VVB-confirmed investment test and no reported reversal events, but the evidence is weakened by missing details on buffer coverage, baseline reassessment, and leakage treatment history. Transparency is moderate because the monitoring period and verifier are identified, yet key public-facing items such as claimed-versus-verified issuance and usage monitoring are not fully stated. Overall confidence is reduced by several document contradictions, especially on credited volume, leakage treatment, safeguards, and crediting period.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1121
Sector	biomass
Country	China
Vintage	2019
Project Methodology	ACM0018 02.0.0
Crediting Period	2011 — 2033
VVB	Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd
Verified ERs	619,890 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2015 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The record shows a large contradiction in verified emission reductions between older and newer validation documents, which raises reliability concerns.
- Leakage was treated as negligible in the latest monitoring report, but an earlier report said it was not addressed.
- The crediting period differs between documents, and the project has two corrective actions noted in the monitoring report.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and the VVB confirmed it in the verification/validation record.
- No buffer pool percentage, baseline reassessment date, or reversal-event detail was found in the extracted record.

The project shows a reasonably strong additionality case because the monitoring/validation record says an investment test was used and that additionality was confirmed by the VVB. However, the extracted record does not state a buffer pool percentage, does not provide a baseline reassessment date, and does not include reversal-event detail, so permanence-related confidence is limited. The latest monitoring report also notes two corrective actions, which slightly weakens confidence in implementation quality.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + The monitoring report identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, and the verified emission reductions for the latest period.
- Claimed-versus-verified issuance, usage monitoring method, and CORSIA status were not stated in the available documents.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring report names Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd and gives a clear monitoring period from 2015-10-01 to 2020-02-29. On the other hand, the extracted record does not state the claimed emission reductions, usage monitoring method, or CORSIA eligibility, leaving important public-accountability fields incomplete. The absence of these details limits the ability to independently reconcile issuance and use claims.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

- + The latest monitoring report states a leakage deduction of 0% with leakage deemed negligible.
- A prior monitoring report said leakage was not addressed, and the verified emission reduction figure differs sharply across validation documents.

Claim safety is mixed. The latest monitoring report says leakage was deemed negligible and applies a 0% deduction, which is positive, but an earlier monitoring report said leakage was not addressed, creating a reliability concern. The verified emission reduction figure also changes materially across validation documents, so the project's crediting claims should be treated cautiously.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

- + The record draws on multiple document types, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, with high extraction confidence.
- Two corrective actions were required, and the crediting period is inconsistent across documents.

Documentation quality is fair because the assessment draws on multiple official sources, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance documents, and extraction confidence is high. Still, two corrective actions were required, and the crediting period is inconsistent between the monitoring report and validation report, which suggests document harmonization issues. The record is therefore usable, but not fully clean or internally consistent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal detail; buffer not stated
● Leakage	0% deduction, but earlier report conflicted
● Baseline	Project baseline stated; reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled issuance/verification table that explains the difference in verified emission reductions across validation documents and confirms the final credited amount.

→ Provide explicit documentation for buffer pool treatment, baseline reassessment, leakage justification history, and CORSIA/CCP status in a single consolidated disclosure.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Project Description
- Validation / Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation

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-09E26A08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy