

## QUALITY REPORT

# Nanba Associated Gas Processing Plant And The Auxiliary Engineering

VCS-1166 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-F8B40761 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.2**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has a basic additionality case (investment test) that was confirmed by the VVB, but key quantifications needed to judge crediting integrity (verified ERs, leakage deduction, baseline reassessment) are not present in the extracted record. Safeguards and grievance provisions are not evidenced, and a material inconsistency exists on the length of the crediting period across documents, increasing over-crediting and interpretation risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1166
Sector	other
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AM0009 06.0.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2012
VVB	ERM Certification and Verification Services (ERM CVS)
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Crediting period is inconsistent between the monitoring report (2012-05-29 to 2012-12-06) and the PDD (2012-04-12 to 2021-04-11), creating uncertainty about the eligible period for issuance.
- Verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record (no verified ER total), limiting the ability to assess over-crediting risk.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.
- Safeguards, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism are not evidenced in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents; leakage is said to be quantified but the deduction value is not found in the extracted record.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record). The baseline approach is project-specific (PDD), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens confidence in baseline validity over time. Leakage is described as quantified (monitoring report), but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to judge whether deductions were appropriately applied. No material findings or corrective actions are reported (monitoring report), which is positive but does not substitute for missing quantifications.

### Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + A named VVB (ERM Certification and Verification Services) and a defined monitoring period are provided in the monitoring report.
- Key MRV outputs (claimed and verified ER totals) are not found in the extracted record, reducing auditability.

The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period (2012-05-29 to 2012-12-06) and identifies the VVB as ERM Certification and Verification Services, supporting basic traceability. However, neither total claimed emission reductions nor total verified emission reductions are found in the extracted record, preventing independent cross-checking of issuance quantities. The registry is listed as CDM while the standard is VCS, which adds contextual ambiguity about where complete issuance and MRV data should be checked, even though it is not presented as a direct contradiction here.

### Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.
- Over-crediting risk cannot be well screened because verified ER totals and leakage deduction values are not found in the extracted record, and the crediting period is inconsistent across documents.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation claims (extracted record). CCP status is not stated in available documents, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity labels. Over-crediting risk cannot be robustly assessed because verified ER totals are not found in the extracted record and leakage is said to be quantified without the deduction value (monitoring report). The inconsistency in crediting period across documents further increases the risk that stakeholders misunderstand what period the credits legitimately cover.

### Documentation — 6.4 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is high.
- The extracted record shows missing key quantified fields (ER totals, leakage deduction, buffer/pooling where relevant) and contains a crediting-period contradiction.

The extracted record references key document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and indicates high extraction confidence, supporting a moderate documentation score. Nonetheless, several critical quantitative fields are not found in the extracted record (claimed/verified ER totals, leakage deduction percentage, buffer pool percentage where relevant), which limits evaluability. Safeguards-related elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are not evidenced in the extracted record, reducing completeness from a quality-assurance perspective.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● <b>Permanence</b>	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified but deduction value missing
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	No FPIC/grievance safeguards evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and reconcile the crediting period across the PDD and monitoring/verification documentation, explicitly stating which period is eligible for VCS issuance and why.

→ Provide the claimed and verified emission reduction totals for the monitoring period, along with the quantified leakage deduction percentage and calculation summary, to enable independent checks.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- 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-F8B40761 · 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)