

# VERIFICATION STATEMENT

## GLOBE Performance Solutions

Verifies the performance of

### CB Shield® Stormwater Quality Device

Developed by CB Shield Inc.  
Oakville, Ontario, Canada

Registration: GPS-ETV\_VR2025-11-30

In accordance with

**ISO 14034:2016**  
Environmental Management —  
Environmental Technology Verification (ETV)



---

Yogendra Chaudhry  
CEO  
GLOBE Performance Solutions

November 25, 2025  
Vancouver, BC, Canada



Verification Body  
GLOBE Performance Solutions  
404 – 999 Canada Place | Vancouver, B.C | Canada | V6C 3E2

## Technology description and application

The CB Shield® technology provides an environmental benefit of controlling sediment wash off at upstream locations. A standard catch basin has a 1.2 m waterfall inflow that churns up sediment in the sump below causing a very poor rate of sediment retention. The CB Shield is a flow deflection device that is inserted into a standard catch basin. It contains a sloped plate to direct runoff to the back wall of the catch basin, thereby dissipating the energy of stormwater inflows. The dissipation of inflow energy allows time for settling of sediment in stormwater runoff, increasing capture and reducing scour/ re-suspension of previously deposited sediment. Installation involves lowering the unit into a standard sized catch basin, and adjusting the height of the unit to the height of the permanent pool in the sump. The unit is manufactured with durable fiberglass requiring little maintenance and is estimated to be operated on the same cleanout schedule set for the catch basin. Due to high rates of scour in a standard catch basin, they are seldom filled beyond 40% of sump capacity. Clean out routines and expenses are optimized when the CB Shield captures and retains more sediment within the sump.

In an urban setting, there are typically approximately 5 catch basins installed per hectare. Assuming an equal distribution of overland flow, the tested flow rates for the scour and capture tests are meaningful in the context of 78 L/s per hectare and 42 L/s per hectare, respectively. The CB Shield's scour prevention performance has been evaluated in a laboratory setting relative to a standard unshielded catch basin for flows of 1.2 to 15.6 L/s. The device's sediment capture performance was evaluated for flows of 0.24 to 8.4 L/s. Hydraulically, the CB Shield has been tested to pass flows up to 60 L/s without any negative impacts (i.e., surcharging).

## Performance conditions

### Claim 1: Capture test

The capture test is carried out in a laboratory with a constructed simulated street scape (1 % slope along its 2.4 m (96 inch) length, 2 % slope along its 1.2 m (48 inch) width). The catch basin was clean of any litter or debris. Capture performance was tested by comparing the mass of retained sediment with the influent sediment mass for each of six inflow rates: 0.24, 0.48, 1.20, 2.40, 6.00, and 8.40 L/s. The test sediment consisted of ground silica (1 – 1000 micron) with a specific gravity of 2.65, uniformly mixed to meet the particle size distribution specified in the *Procedure for Laboratory Testing of Oil Grit Separators* (TRCA, 2014). Sediment was injected onto the street scape at a point just upstream of the catch basin to allow mixing prior to discharge while avoiding excessive buildup of sediment on the street scape. The sediment feed rate was adjusted for each flow rate to keep the influent concentrations consistent at 200 mg/L. The tests were conducted with a false floor set at 300 mm below the outlet invert simulating a catch basin that is filled to 50% of the manufacturer's recommended maximum sediment storage.

### Claim 2: Scour test

The scour test was carried out in a laboratory on catch basins with and without the CB Shield® insert with a constructed simulated street scape (1 % slope along its 2.4 m (96 inch) length, 2 % slope along its 1.2 m (48 inch) width) and the catch basins clean of any litter or debris. A false floor was set in the catch basins at 254 mm below the outlet invert and preloaded with the test sediment (1- 1000 micron silica blend) test up to 150 mm below the outlet invert simulating a catch basin that is ¾ full of sediment. Water was filled to the effluent pipe and sediments were allowed to settle for 12-24 hours. Flows of 1.2, 4.8, 8.4, 12, and 15.6 L/s were tested on a continuous run with flow rates maintained at 5 minutes and a one minute transition time between flow rates. A minimum effluent grab sample of 500 mL was collected in 1000 mL jars by holding it under the entire effluent stream. A sample was taken at 30 seconds during the flow

transitions to account for scour during the transition. Background samples were also taken at least once every flow rate and effluent concentrations were corrected accordingly. Effluent flow was filtered using a 10 $\mu\text{m}$  filter and was recycled during the continuous 30 min test.

## Performance claim(s)

### Claim 1: Capture test

During the sediment capture test, for a catch basin with a false floor set to 50% of the manufacturer's recommended maximum sediment storage depth and a constant influent sediment concentration of 200 mg/L, the catch basin with a CB Shield® insert removed 64, 59.9, 52.4, 42.6, 25.2, and 26.7 percent of influent test sediment by mass at inflow rates of 0.24, 0.48, 1.20, 2.40, 6.00, and 8.40 L/s, respectively.

### Claim 2: Scour test

For a catch basin filled to three quarters of the manufacturer's recommended maximum sediment storage depth, with the CB Shield® insert, scouring of test sediment is at most 8% of the control catch basin during a continuous 30 minute scour test run with 5 minute duration inflows of 1.2, 4.8, 8.4, 12.0, and 15.6 L/s.

## Performance results

The test sediment used to evaluate the CB Shield® technology was the same as that required by CETV for the evaluation of Oil Grit Separators. The comparison of the average test sediment PSD to the CETV specified PSD in Figure 1 indicates that the test sediment was finer than the specified PSD, with a median particle size of approximately 50 microns.




Figure 1. Test sediment particle size distribution (PSD) in relation to specified PSD.

The capacity of the device to retain sediment was determined at six surface loading rates using the modified mass balance method (see TRCA, 2014). During each of the tested flow rates, a known quantity of sediment was injected at a constant rate onto a simulated street scape just upstream of the catch basin containing the CB Shield® technology. Based on these results, removal efficiencies were determined for each of the tested surface loading rates (Table 1).

Table 1. Removal efficiencies (%) based on modified mass balance results at specified surface loading rates.

Flow rate (L/s)	0.24	0.48	1.20	2.40	6.00	8.40
Surface loading rate (L/min/m <sup>2</sup> )	40	80	200	400	1000	1400
Total mass added (kg)	1.217	2.302	5.072	5.150	4.921	4.812
Total mass captured (kg)	0.778	1.378	2.659	2.196	1.238	1.287
Removal efficiency (%)	64.0	59.9	52.4	42.6	25.2	26.7

Table 2 shows the results of the sediment scour and re-suspension test. This test involved preloading fresh test sediment into the sedimentation area of two catch basins with and without the CB Shield technology, as described in Performance Conditions section above. Effluent samples were collected at one-minute sampling intervals and analyzed for Suspended Sediment Concentration (SSC). The mean sediment scour load of the catch basin with the CB shield insert was shown to be only 5% that of the control catch basin.

Table 2. Scour test effluent sediment concentration and loads.

Run	Flow rates (L/sec)	Surface loading rate (L/min/m <sup>2</sup> )	CB Shield®			Control		
			Run time (min)	Effluent suspended sediment concentration (mg/L)	Sediment load (g)	Run time (min)	Effluent suspended sediment concentration (mg/L)	Sediment load (g)
1	1.2	200	1:00	17.7	1.3	1:00	129.2	9.7
			2:00	6.5	0.47	2:00	185.3	13.9
			3:00	2.7	0.19	3:00	206.0	15.5
			4:00	3.1	0.22	4:00	176.0	13.2
			5:00	4.6	0.33	5:00	523.6	39.4
			6:00	0.6	0.04	6:00	495.7	41.8
			<b>Sum</b>		<b>2.6</b>	<b>Sum</b>		<b>133.5</b>
2	4.8	800	7:00	8.2	2.4	7:00	7164.0	2069.0
			8:00	4	1.2	8:00	8094.0	2338.0
			9:00	0.6	0.2	9:00	6762.0	1950.0
			10:00	0.6	0.2	10:00	4842.0	1393.0
			11:00	1.7	0.5	11:00	5266.0	1517.0
			12:00	0.6	0.2	12:00	4768.0	1457.0
			<b>Sum</b>		<b>4.7</b>	<b>Sum</b>		<b>10724.0</b>
3	8.4	1400	13:00	5.4	2.7	13:00	5429.0	2725.0
			14:00	10.0	5.0	14:00	6648.0	3332.0
			15:00	9.5	4.8	15:00	5025.0	2528.0
			16:00	10.0	5.0	16:00	5859.0	2939.0
			17:00	8.4	4.2	17:00	5019.0	2515.0
			18:00	8.2	4.1	18:00	3249.0	1628.0
			<b>Sum</b>		<b>25.8</b>	<b>Sum</b>		<b>15667.0</b>
4	12	2000	19:00	38.4	27.6	25:30	1886.0	1347.0
			20:00	79.4	57.2	26:30	1432.0	1027.0
			21:00	113.0	81.3	27:30	1167.0	844.0
			22:00	103.0	74.2	28:30	1508.0	1089.0
			23:00	114.0	82.1	29:30	1100.0	795.0
			24:00	92.3	66.5	30:30	708.0	512.0
			<b>Sum</b>		<b>388.9</b>	<b>Sum</b>		<b>5614.0</b>
5	15.6	2600	25:00	117.4	166.0	52:30	386.9	364.8
			26:00	211.6	198.1	53:30	252.7	237.8
			27:00	220.3	206.2	54:30	372.5	349.6
			28:00	187.8	175.8	55:30	332.4	311.7
			29:00	224.4	210.0	56:30	279.8	262.6
			30:00	199.2	186.5	57:30	310.2	290.9
			<b>Sum</b>		<b>1142.6</b>	<b>Sum</b>		<b>1817.4</b>
<b>Total load</b>				<b>1564.6</b>				<b>33956.0</b>

## Potential sources of error

1. Background concentrations during the scour test were measured to be generally under 5 mg/L for both CB Shield® and Control treatments. However, background concentrations for the Control treatment at flow rates of 12.0 L/s and 15.6 L/s were substantially higher than the expected threshold of 20 mg/L as a result of inefficient recycling of water in the laboratory. Effluent samples were corrected based on the measured background concentrations since it was assumed that background sediments consisted of fine particles that were not captured in the device and flowed through as effluent concentration. If instead, some of the background sediments settled, the correction for all background sediments would bias against the relative performance of the CB Shield and therefore result in a more conservative evaluation of the CB Shield technology performance.
2. The reduction in scour at higher flow rates for the Control treatment suggested that the amount of preloaded sediment (10.2 cm depth) may have been insufficient to provide a continuous supply of fine particles for scour throughout the test. A similar decrease in scour at high flow rates was not observed for the CB Shield® treatment. This interpretation of the data implies that preloading both catch basins with additional sediment would likely have shown increased relative scour for the Control treatment, particularly at high flow rates. Although further testing would be required to verify this interpretation, it is reasonable to suggest that the test as conducted may have produced a smaller relative difference, resulting in a more conservative claim for the CB Shield technology.

## Verification

This verification was first completed in October, 2016 and is considered valid for subsequent renewal periods every three (3) years thereafter. Data and information provided by CB Shield Inc. to support the performance claim included the following: Performance test report prepared by Good Harbour Laboratories of Mississauga, Ontario, dated 24 August 2016; the report was based on testing completed in accordance with the Procedure for Laboratory Testing of Oil-Grit Separators (Version 3.0, June 2014).

The original verification was completed by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, contracted by GLOBE Performance Solutions, using the Canadian ETV Program's General Verification Protocol (June 2012) and taking into account ISO/CDIS 14034:2015(E). This ETV renewal is considered to meet the equivalency of an ETV verification completed using the International Standard *ISO 14034:2016 Environmental management -- Environmental technology verification (ETV)*.

## What is ISO 14034:2016 Environmental management – Environmental technology verification (ETV)?

ISO 14034:2016 specifies principles, procedures and requirements for environmental technology verification (ETV) and was developed and published by the *International Organization for Standardization (ISO)*. The objective of ETV is to provide credible, reliable and independent verification of the performance of environmental technologies. An environmental technology is a technology that either results in an environmental added value or measures parameters that indicate an environmental impact. Such technologies have an increasingly important role in addressing environmental challenges and achieving sustainable development.

**For more information on the CB Shield®  
Stormwater Quality Device please contact:**

CB Shield Inc.  
39 Uplands Drive  
Brantford, ON  
N3R 6H5 Canada  
Tel: 519-212-9161  
[info@cbshield.com](mailto:info@cbshield.com)  
[www.cbshield.com](http://www.cbshield.com)

**For more information on ISO 14034:2016 / ETV  
please contact:**

GLOBE Performance Solutions  
404 – 999 Canada Place  
Vancouver, BC  
V6C 3E2 Canada  
Tel: 604-695-5018 / Toll Free: 1-855-695-5018  
[etv@globeperformance.com](mailto:etv@globeperformance.com)  
[www.globeperformance.com](http://www.globeperformance.com)

**Limitation of verification - Registration: GPS-ETV\_VR2025-11-30**

GLOBE Performance Solutions and the Verification Expert provide the verification services solely on the basis of the information supplied by the applicant or vendor and assume no liability thereafter. The responsibility for the information supplied remains solely with the applicant or vendor and the liability for the purchase, installation, and operation (whether consequential or otherwise) is not transferred to any other party as a result of the verification.