QUALITY REPORT

El Panul

VCS-1228 · VCS · Chile

Report ID: CM-06E74B1C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.6
	Transparency (25%)	6.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS landfill-gas methane avoidance project has VVB-confirmed additionality and matching claimed vs verified emission reductions for the reported monitoring period. However, leakage is not addressed in the extracted record and there is a material inconsistency in the stated crediting period across documents, which increases over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1228
Sector	methane
Country	Chile
Vintage	2008
Project Methodology	ACM0001 8
Crediting Period	2008 — 2009
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Verified ERs	17,973 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2008 — 2009
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, despite methane projects often having potential upstream/downstream leakage considerations.

- Crediting period is contradictory between the monitoring report (2008–2009) and the validation report (2009–2019), creating uncertainty about the scope of credited reductions.

- Multiple corrective action requests were raised (CAR 4.1-1, 4.1-2, 4.1-5, 4.2-1), indicating MRV/control weaknesses at the time of assessment.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation in the extracted record).

- Leakage was not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record.

The extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH) using an investment test, which supports additionality robustness. The baseline is project-specific (monitoring report, 2012-03-15) and there is no stated timing for baseline reassessment in the extracted record, which weakens baseline credibility over time. Leakage is explicitly marked as not addressed and no leakage deduction is provided in the extracted record, which is a material integrity gap for methane avoidance projects. No material findings are reported, but several corrective action requests were raised, suggesting issues were identified that needed resolution.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ Claimed and verified emission reductions match (17,973 tCO2e) for the stated monitoring period in the monitoring report (2012-03-15).

- The crediting period is inconsistent across documents, reducing clarity on what period the ERs relate to.

The monitoring report (2012-03-15) provides a clear monitoring period (2008-03-01 to 2009-10-05) and shows claimed ERs equal verified ERs (17,973 tCO2e), which supports MRV consistency. The VVB is identified (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH), aiding traceability. However, the extracted record contains a major inconsistency on the crediting period between the monitoring report and the validation report, reducing transparency on the scope of credited reductions. Safeguards information is also inconsistent across documents, which reduces clarity on non-carbon requirements.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing aviation-claim overlap risk.

- Project-specific baseline and missing reassessment timing increase over-crediting risk.

The project is listed as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, which lowers the risk of overlapping claims in the CORSIA channel. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity label claims. The baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, which can elevate over-crediting risk if conditions change. Leakage is not addressed and no deduction is stated, which increases the risk that credited reductions are overstated.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are available (monitoring report, validation report, PDD) and extraction confidence is high.

- Contradictions between documents (safeguards mention and crediting period) and the presence of multiple CARs weaken document reliability.

Key documents are present in the extracted record (monitoring report, validation report, and PDD), and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting document usability. The monitoring report is dated 2012-03-15 and covers the 2008–2009 monitoring period, indicating the documentation is not very recent relative to the project start. Multiple corrective action requests (CAR 4.1-1, 4.1-2, 4.1-5, 4.2-1) indicate documentation/control issues were identified during review. Contradictions across documents (safeguards mention and crediting period) reduce confidence in completeness and consistency.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Reversal/buffer not evidenced
Leakage	Leakage not addressed
Baseline	Project-specific; reassessment not stated
Safeguards	Safeguards not reliably evidenced
Double-claim	Not CORSIA; CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

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

→ Resolve and publicly clarify the crediting period discrepancy (validation vs monitoring) and link issued/verified ERs to a single, consistent crediting timeline.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-06E74B1C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy