QUALITY REPORT

Fuzhou Hongmiaoling Landfill Gas To Electricity Project

VCS-253 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-711E0FC3 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.6 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	6.8
Claim Safety (25%)	6.4
Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This landfill-gas-to-electricity project shows moderate integrity: additionality is confirmed by the VVB and the claimed reductions match the verified amount. However, leakage treatment is not evidenced in the extracted record and the baseline is project-specific with no clear reassessment timing. Documentation coverage is relatively strong, but contradictions across documents reduce confidence in some non-carbon safeguard claims and in the stated crediting period.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-253
Sector	methane
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0001 05
Crediting Period	2007 — 2017
VVB	Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd
Verified ERs	231,904 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no justification and no stated deduction), which is a material gap for methane projects.
- Crediting period dates conflict between the validation report (2008–2018) and a later monitoring report (2007–2017), raising data reliability concerns.
- Safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing are inconsistently reported across monitoring reports (2009 vs 2021).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The verification/monitoring record shows additionality confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, and no material findings or corrective actions were reported.

- Leakage is not evidenced (no deduction stated and leakage justification not addressed), and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents.

The monitoring/verification record indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2021). The same monitoring report shows no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports procedural integrity. However, leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no justification and no stated deduction), and the baseline is project-specific with no stated reassessment date, both of which weaken robustness for a methane project.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Claimed and verified emission reductions match (231,904 tCO2e), and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2011-07-01 to 2017-11-18) in the monitoring report (2021).

- Key MRV context fields are missing in the extracted record (e.g., grid EF year and baseline reassessment timing), and safeguards reporting is inconsistent across documents.

The monitoring report (2021) provides a clear monitoring period (2011-07-01 to 2017-11-18) and the claimed reductions equal the verified reductions (231,904 tCO2e), which supports transparency of results. The VVB is identified (Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd), aiding traceability. Still, some key contextual parameters are incomplete in the extracted record (e.g., grid EF year and baseline reassessment timing), and safeguards-related statements vary across documents, reducing clarity.

Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

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

- Over-crediting risk is harder to rule out because leakage treatment is not evidenced and the baseline is project-specific with no documented reassessment date.

The project is listed as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, which lowers the risk of higher-stakes aviation-related claims. At the same time, the baseline is project-specific and the extracted record does not evidence any leakage treatment, which increases the risk of over-crediting or overly confident claims. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on that label as a quality signal.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (monitoring report, validation report, PDD, issuance) with 11 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Contradictions between documents (crediting period and safeguards-related statements) indicate internal inconsistency that weakens documentary reliability.

The extracted record references multiple core document types (monitoring report, validation report, PDD, and issuance) and indicates 11 documents were used with high extraction confidence, supporting completeness. The monitoring report is relatively recent (2021-09-10). However, contradictions across documents (including crediting period and safeguards-related fields) reduce confidence that the documentation is internally consistent.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No reversal events reported
● **Leakage**	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistently documented
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

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

→ Clarify and reconcile the crediting period dates across the validation and monitoring reports (e.g., via a registry note or formal project description update) and document any baseline reassessment.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-711E0FC3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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