QUALITY REPORT

Guizhou Jinyan CMM Power Generation Project

VCS-2895 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-8ED14A30 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.5 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS coal mine methane power project has VVB-confirmed additionality and a defined monitoring period with verified ERs, which supports basic credibility. However, key baseline parameters and leakage quantification are not clearly captured in the extracted record, and a leakage treatment inconsistency between the PDD and monitoring report raises reliability and over-crediting concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2895
Sector	methane
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0008 08.0
Crediting Period	2020 — 2030
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Verified ERs	126,134 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the PDD does not address leakage, while the monitoring report claims leakage was quantified.
- ■ Corrective actions were required for an inaccurate emission reduction calculation, increasing over-crediting risk.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

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

- Baseline is described only as project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment was not found in the extracted record.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record). The baseline approach is only described as project-specific, and the date of any baseline reassessment was not found in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline robustness. Leakage is flagged as “quantified” in the monitoring report (2022-09-06), but the leakage deduction itself was not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to judge completeness.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2022-09-06) provides a clear monitoring period (2020-10-01—2021-12-31) and verified ERs (126,134 tCO2e).

- Key quantification inputs (e.g., grid emission factor/year and leakage deduction) were not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2022-09-06) clearly states the monitoring period (2020-10-01—2021-12-31) and reports verified emission reductions of 126,134 tCO2e. However, several key MRV inputs (such as the grid emission factor and its reference year) were not found in the extracted record, reducing reproducibility for external reviewers. The presence of corrective actions also suggests the initial reporting required fixes before assurance could be relied upon.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ Verified ERs are reported by an identified VVB (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH), supporting third-party assurance.

- Corrective actions for inaccurate ER calculation and unclear leakage deduction increase over-crediting/claims risk.

The project’s claims benefit from third-party verification by TÜV NORD CERT GmbH and a stated verified ER total in the monitoring report (2022-09-06). Claim risk remains moderate because corrective actions included an inaccurate emission reduction calculation, which is directly relevant to over-crediting risk. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so downstream buyer eligibility/label claims cannot be safely inferred.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence across 12 documents.

- Corrective actions included a missing statement of competence and an inaccurate ER calculation, indicating documentation/QA weaknesses.

The extracted record indicates a relatively complete document set (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and 12 documents used, with high extraction confidence. Still, the monitoring report (2022-09-06) lists corrective actions including a missing statement of competence and an inaccurate ER calculation, which points to weaknesses in quality control and supporting evidence. Some important quantitative fields (e.g., grid emission factor, leakage deduction) were not found in the extracted record despite the document set.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No reversal risk indicated for CMM power
● **Leakage**	Leakage inconsistent/unclear deduction
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment unclear
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the full leakage calculation and resulting leakage deduction (or explicit 0% with justification) consistently across the PDD and monitoring report.

→ Publish/clearly cite the grid emission factor value and reference year used for the monitoring period, and document any baseline reassessment schedule or triggers.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Report

Report ID: CM-8ED14A30 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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