

QUALITY REPORT

UPGRADE OF DOMINICAN POWER PARTNERS' LOS MINA POWER STATION FROM OPEN CYCLE TO COMBINED CYCLE POWER GENERATION

VCS-1103 · VCS · Dominican Republic

Report ID: CM-C02D6419 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; color: green;">6.9</div> <p>Overall Score out of 10</p>	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> ■ Integrity (35%) 6.6 </div>
	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> ■ Transparency (25%) 7.2 </div>
	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> ■ Claim Safety (25%) 6.8 </div>
	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> ■ Documentation (15%) 7.6 </div>

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS avoidance project has a reasonably robust integrity case, with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no material findings or corrective actions reported in the extracted record. However, key quantitative elements (notably leakage deduction and baseline reassessment timing) are missing, and several cross-document inconsistencies reduce confidence in the reliability of non-quantitative disclosures.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1103
Sector	industrial
Country	Dominican Republic
Vintage	2018, 2019, 2020, 2021
Project Methodology	ACM0007 6.1.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2027
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A.(Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	1,144,395 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Verified ERs (1,144,395) are materially lower than claimed ERs (1,202,884), indicating over-claiming risk or conservative verification adjustments.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.
- Crediting period dates conflict between the monitoring report (2017–2027) and the PDD (2016–2025), creating uncertainty about the applicable crediting timeline.
- Safeguards and grievance mechanism are reported in the monitoring report but were not stated in the validation report, suggesting inconsistent social risk documentation over time.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.6 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed using an investment test and confirmed by the VVB.
- Leakage is said to be quantified, but the leakage deduction value and baseline reassessment timing are not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring/verification record indicates additionality was demonstrated via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2022). The baseline is project-specific under ACM0007, but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2022; PDD, 2013). Leakage is described as quantified, yet the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found, which weakens confidence in net ER conservativeness (monitoring report, 2022). No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2022).

Transparency — 7.2 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and the VVB is identified (Applus+).
- Claimed vs verified ERs differ (1,202,884 vs 1,144,395) and some key parameters (e.g., leakage deduction) are not clearly reported in the extracted record.

Core project documentation appears available across the project lifecycle (PDD 2013, validation report 2013, monitoring report 2022, and issuance records). The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2017-04-01 to 2021-10-31 (monitoring report, 2022). A notable transparency signal is the gap between claimed and verified ERs (1,202,884 claimed vs 1,144,395 verified), but the extracted record does not provide enough detail here to fully explain the adjustment (monitoring report, 2022). Some key quantified items (e.g., leakage deduction) are not clearly captured in the extracted record, limiting reproducibility.

Claim Safety — 6.8 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream aviation-claim risks.
- Project-specific baseline and missing leakage deduction value increase over-crediting/claims uncertainty.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of contentious aviation-related claims (monitoring report, 2022). However, over-crediting risk remains moderately elevated because the baseline is project-specific and the extracted record does not show when the baseline was last reassessed (PDD, 2013; monitoring report, 2022). The difference between claimed and verified ERs suggests the verifier applied adjustments or conservativeness, but it also signals that headline claims based on “claimed” numbers would be unsafe (monitoring report, 2022). CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity labels.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

- + Document set is relatively complete (8 documents used) with high extraction confidence and no reported corrective actions.
- Contradictions between the PDD/validation report and the monitoring report (crediting period, safeguards, grievance mechanism) reduce document consistency.

The extracted record draws on a reasonably complete set of documents (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 8 documents used. The VVB is identified as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification) (monitoring report, 2022). No corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which supports document quality for the period assessed (monitoring report, 2022). Nonetheless, internal consistency issues across documents (notably safeguards/grievance and crediting period dates) reduce documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Quantified but deduction not shown
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Mentioned later; inconsistent across documents
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the quantified leakage deduction (percentage and calculation) and show how it was applied to arrive at verified ERs.

→ Clarify the applicable crediting period and document any renewal/revision between the PDD and later monitoring/issuance records, including baseline reassessment timing.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Listing Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report

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-C02D6419 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy