

QUALITY REPORT

# CHN/WMC/WHD/VER/26052025/00004

OG-68343ca1 · VCS · China Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-490ECAD4 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>0.9</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>1.5</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>0.0</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>1.2</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>0.5</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project details from official documents, and the minimum extraction confidence is low. With no evidence on baseline setting, additionality, leakage, or monitoring/verification outcomes, the project cannot be credibly assessed and should be treated as high risk until documentation is provided.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-68343ca1
Sector	industrial
Country	China Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No official project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV claims
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or incorrect data

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- No information found in the extracted record on additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, or any verification findings

~ No contradictions were detected, but this is not meaningful given the absence of source documents

No official documents were available in the extracted record, so there is no evidence on how additionality was demonstrated, what baseline method was used, whether leakage was assessed, or whether any material findings/corrective actions occurred. With the minimum extraction confidence marked low, the risk that key integrity-relevant details are missing is elevated. This warrants a very low integrity score pending document availability.

### Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or claimed vs verified emission reductions were found in the extracted record

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be checked because no evidence documents were provided

The extracted record does not include a verification body name, monitoring period, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions, so MRV transparency cannot be assessed. No registry-relevant fields (such as eligibility flags) were found either. Given the absence of evidence documents and low extraction confidence, transparency is scored very low.

### Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- Over-crediting and greenwashing risk cannot be evaluated because baseline approach, leakage justification, and any default factors are not available

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, so double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be screened

Because baseline approach, leakage justification, and any parameters that drive crediting are not present in the extracted record, the risk of over-crediting cannot be screened. Eligibility indicators (such as CORSIA or CCP status) were not found, so potential downstream claim risks also cannot be evaluated. This results in a low claim-safety score driven by evidence gaps.

### Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were included in the extracted record (0 documents used)

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing confidence in completeness and accuracy

The extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence document list, meaning documentation is effectively unavailable for assessment. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability for at least one key source and further undermining reliability. Documentation is therefore scored near the floor.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Reversal/buffer information not found
● <b>Leakage</b>	No leakage treatment found
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not found
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards evidence not found
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not found

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the core VCS document set (PDD, validation report, latest monitoring report, latest verification report, and issuance/registry extracts) so baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV can be checked

→ Improve document readability/scan quality and re-run extraction to raise confidence and enable cross-checking of claimed versus verified emission reductions and any findings/corrective actions

### 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-490ECAD4 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)