QUALITY REPORT

Anhui Zhujixi CMM Utilization Project

VCS-4559 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-F053E09F · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	6.8
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
	Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a methane utilization project with VVB-verified additionality and no material findings reported, which supports a moderate integrity score. However, several key items are missing or inconsistent across documents, especially leakage treatment, safeguards, and the handling of contradictions between the monitoring and validation/issuance records. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated, so double-claim risk cannot be fully ruled out from the extracted record alone.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-4559
Sector	methane
Country	China
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0008 08.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2031
VVB	China Classification Society Certification Co., Ltd.
Verified ERs	115,119 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the monitoring report says it was quantified, while the validation report says it was not addressed.
- ■ Safeguards-related items were marked false in the validation report but true in the monitoring report, creating a reliability concern.
- ■ No buffer pool percentage, reversal detail, or usage monitoring method was found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB, China Classification Society Certification Co., Ltd., in the monitoring report.

- Leakage treatment is disputed across documents, and reversal events are not addressed in the extracted record.

The monitoring report dated 2024-10-10 shows an investment-test additionality case that was confirmed by the VVB, and it reports no material findings or corrective actions required. The project uses ACM0008 version 08.0, but the extracted record does not state a buffer pool percentage, and reversal events are listed as not addressed, which weakens permanence confidence. Leakage is a major weakness because the monitoring report says it was quantified, while the validation report says it was not addressed; I privileged the more recent monitoring report, but the contradiction still lowers reliability.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period and crediting period are clearly stated, and the monitoring report reports no material findings or corrective actions required.

- The extracted record does not state the usage monitoring method, claimed-versus-verified issuance comparison, or buffer pool percentage.

The monitoring period and crediting period are clearly disclosed, and the VVB is named, which helps traceability. However, the extracted record does not state the usage monitoring method, claimed-versus-verified issuance comparison, or any baseline reassessment timing. The absence of these details limits MRV transparency even though the documentation set is relatively broad.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of dual-claim concern.

- Leakage and safeguards inconsistencies, plus missing CCP status and missing usage-rate evidence, leave residual over-crediting and claim-risk concerns.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one major dual-channel claim risk. Still, the record lacks CCP status, and the missing usage-rate evidence plus the leakage contradiction create some over-crediting concern. Because the validation report and monitoring report disagree on leakage treatment, I relied on the later monitoring report for the score, but the inconsistency still depresses claim safety.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and extraction confidence is high.

- Several important fields remain unstated, including buffer pool, usage monitoring method, and reversal detail, limiting documentary completeness.

The evidence set includes validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance documents, and extraction confidence is high, which supports a decent documentation score. The monitoring report is recent relative to the crediting period and reports no material findings or corrective actions. Even so, several important items are not stated in the extracted record, including buffer pool, usage monitoring method, and reversal detail, so completeness is only moderate.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No buffer or reversal detail stated
● **Leakage**	Leakage treatment contradicted
● **Baseline**	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards present but inconsistently documented
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unstated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear leakage assessment with the same treatment across validation, monitoring, and issuance documents, including any quantified deduction.

→ Disclose the usage monitoring method, buffer pool or reversal handling, and CCP status to reduce claim and permanence uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-F053E09F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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