QUALITY REPORT

Nanhai Msw Incineration II Project

VCS-2098 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-322E7115 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.1 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	6.0
Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows moderate integrity: additionality is confirmed by the VVB via an investment test, and no material findings or corrective actions are reported. However, key quantifications that affect crediting confidence—especially the leakage deduction percentage and baseline reassessment timing—are not found in the extracted record, and there is a material inconsistency in the stated crediting period across documents.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2098
Sector	industrial
Country	China
Vintage	2017, 2018
Project Methodology	AM0025 12
Crediting Period	2011 — 2041
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	960,750 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Crediting period is inconsistent between the monitoring report (2011–2041) and the PDD (2012–2019), raising reliability and over-crediting risk.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.

- Leakage is said to be quantified, but the monitoring record does not provide the leakage deduction percentage, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record). The monitoring report (2020) reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports procedural integrity. However, although leakage is described as quantified, the leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, and the baseline is project-specific with no stated date of last reassessment, both of which weaken confidence in the robustness of credited reductions.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ A long monitoring period is specified (2011-06-01 to 2018-12-31) and a verified ER figure is provided (960,750).

- Key MRV inputs are missing from the extracted record (e.g., grid emission factor/year and claimed ERs), limiting reproducibility.

The monitoring report (2020) clearly states the monitoring period (2011-06-01 to 2018-12-31) and provides a verified emissions reduction total of 960,750. At the same time, the claimed ER total is not found in the extracted record, preventing a direct claimed-versus-verified comparison. Key calculation inputs such as the grid emission factor and grid EF year are also not found in the extracted record, reducing third-party reproducibility of the ER calculation.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ No material findings or corrective actions are reported, reducing the likelihood of known unresolved non-conformities.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, and the crediting-period contradiction increases over-crediting/claims risk.

Because the baseline is project-specific (as stated in the extracted record) and the timing of baseline reassessment is not stated, there is elevated risk that baseline assumptions could become outdated over a long crediting horizon. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so the risk profile for downstream claims cannot be clearly bounded. The inconsistency in crediting period across documents further increases the risk of confusion or mis-claims about what vintages and periods are legitimately creditable.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Multiple core document types are present (monitoring report, validation report, PDD) with high extraction confidence across 8 documents.

- Presence of an “unknown” document type and a key internal inconsistency (crediting period) indicate documentation/record-control weaknesses.

The extracted record indicates a reasonably complete document set (monitoring report, validation report, and PDD among 8 documents) and high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation score. The monitoring report is relatively recent (2020-09-01) and includes key outcome reporting (verified ERs) and monitoring dates. However, an “unknown” document type appears in the evidence list, and some critical quantitative fields (claimed ERs, leakage deduction percentage, grid EF) are not found in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● **Leakage**	Quantified but deduction not provided
● **Baseline**	Project-specific; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the explicit leakage deduction percentage and the underlying leakage calculation from the monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Resolve and document the authoritative crediting period (with registry evidence or VVB confirmation) and disclose key calculation inputs such as the grid emission factor and its reference year.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-322E7115 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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