

QUALITY REPORT

Gansu Ganzhou Biogas Recovery and Utilization Project

VCS-3766 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-F3611608 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has a solid documentation base with VVB involvement and no reported material findings, but key integrity parameters (baseline reassessment, leakage treatment, and several quantification inputs) are not evidenced in the extracted record. Safeguards elements (FPIC and grievance mechanism) are described, which reduces social-risk concerns, yet the lack of explicit leakage treatment and missing claimed-versus-verified comparisons increase over-crediting uncertainty.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3766
Sector	biogas
Country	China
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS-III.D 21.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2028
VVB	CTI Certification CO., LTD.
Verified ERs	10,156 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

■ Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no justification and no stated deduction), which increases over-crediting risk.

■ Several core quantification inputs are not found in the extracted record (e.g., grid emission factor and its year; total ERR claimed), limiting independent reasonableness checks.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the record).

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

The project uses a project-specific baseline approach (baseline described as project-based in the extracted record), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens baseline robustness. Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/assurance documentation referenced), supporting integrity, but the specific additionality test type is not found in the extracted record. Leakage treatment is a key weakness: the extracted record indicates leakage is not addressed and provides no leakage deduction, which increases the risk of over-crediting for a waste/biogas activity.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ Monitoring period and verified ERs are clearly stated (monitoring report dated 2023-12-01 reports 10,156 tCO₂e verified for 2021-08-01—2022-12-31).

- Total ERs claimed are not found in the extracted record, and key calculation parameters (e.g., grid emission factor/year) are also not found.

The monitoring report (dated 2023-12-01) clearly states the monitoring period (2021-08-01—2022-12-31) and the verified emission reductions (10,156 tCO₂e), which supports MRV transparency. However, the total emission reductions claimed are not found in the extracted record, preventing a straightforward claimed-versus-verified comparison. Important calculation inputs such as the grid emission factor and the grid EF year are also not found, limiting third-party reproducibility from the extracted dataset.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ No material findings are reported and all raised CARs/CLs were closed (monitoring report/assurance documentation).

- Leakage is not addressed, and CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in available documents, increasing buyer claim and over-crediting uncertainty.

No material findings are reported, and the monitoring/assurance documentation notes that 7 CARs and 6 CLs were raised and successfully closed, which reduces the likelihood of unresolved MRV issues. At the same time, leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no justification and no deduction stated), which elevates over-crediting and greenwashing risk for buyers. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot rely on these labels for higher-integrity claims based on the extracted record alone.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Multiple core document types are evidenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence and 10 documents used.

- The record includes an 'unknown' document type and does not provide some key quantified fields (e.g., claimed ERs, grid EF), indicating completeness gaps.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the extracted record references a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, with 10 documents used and high extraction confidence. The presence of safeguards-related elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing described) indicates that non-carbon documentation exists beyond pure quantification. Nonetheless, some key quantified fields are missing from the extracted record (e.g., total ERs claimed, grid EF/year), and one evidence document is categorized as 'unknown', indicating remaining completeness/traceability gaps.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal risk indicated for biogas; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed / no deduction stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment and, if applicable, a quantified leakage deduction with justification in the monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Disclose key calculation parameters and reconciliation items (grid emission factor and year, and total ERs claimed vs verified) to enable independent replication and reduce over-crediting uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- 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-F3611608 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy