

QUALITY REPORT

Xingning Tokzin PET Recycling Project

VCS-4703 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-32C13438 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.2

Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| ■ Integrity (35%) | 4.8 |
| ■ Transparency (25%) | 4.1 |
| ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 4.0 |
| ■ Documentation (15%) | 3.6 |

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including VVB-verified additionality and no material findings in the validation report. However, key MRV and environmental-risk details are missing, leakage is not addressed, and the record quality is weakened by low extraction confidence and document contradictions.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Registry | Verra (VCS) |
| Registry ID | VCS-4703 |
| Sector | other |
| Country | China |
| Vintage | Recent |
| Project Methodology | AMS-III.AJ. 09.0 |
| Crediting Period | 2022 — 2029 |
| VVB | CTI Certification Co., Ltd |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 7 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-08 |

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is not addressed, with no quantified deduction or justification found.
- No buffer pool, reversal handling, or monitoring-period details were found in the extracted record.
- The extracted record contains contradictions on the additionality test type and benefit-sharing disclosure, reducing reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, and the validation report reports no material findings.
- Leakage is not addressed, and reversal risk is not explained; no buffer pool percentage was found in the available documents.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test and reports no material findings, which supports the project's core crediting logic. That said, leakage is not addressed, reversal events are marked as not addressed, and no buffer pool percentage was found, so permanence and leakage robustness are weak. The baseline is described only as a project baseline, with no reassessment date found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

- + The project is validated by CTI Certification Co., Ltd under VCS, and the validation report is dated 2024-07-23.
- The monitoring period, total verified versus claimed emission reductions, and usage monitoring details are not stated in the extracted record.

The project is validated by CTI Certification Co., Ltd under VCS, and the validation report date is available. However, the monitoring period, total claimed versus verified emission reductions, usage monitoring method, and verified usage rate are all not stated in the extracted record. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the documentation is complete.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline under AMS-III.AJ., which is at least a defined methodology rather than an unstated baseline.
- Leakage is not treated, and no FNRB value, usage-rate evidence, or CORSIA/CCP status was found, leaving over-crediting and claim-risk questions unresolved.

Claim safety is weakened by the absence of leakage treatment and the lack of FNRB, usage-rate, and verified reduction figures. The methodology is identified as AMS-III.AJ. with a project baseline, but there is no evidence in the extracted record that the key over-crediting checks were quantified. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available documents.

Documentation — 3.6 / 10

- + The record includes a validation report and PDD, with seven documents used and safeguards plus grievance mechanisms mentioned.
- Extraction confidence is low, several key fields are missing, and the record contains contradictions on additionality test type and benefit-sharing disclosure.

The available record includes a validation report and a PDD, and it notes seven documents used, which is a positive sign. Even so, min extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key document was hard to read, and several critical fields remain missing. The contradictions on additionality test type and benefit-sharing disclosure also reduce documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| ● Additionality | VVB-confirmed investment test |
| ● Permanence | Reversal risk not addressed |
| ● Leakage | No leakage treatment found |
| ● Baseline | Project baseline stated, reassessment missing |
| ● Safeguards | FPIC and grievance mechanism present |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA/CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring report with verified emission reductions, monitoring period, usage-rate evidence, and any leakage calculations.

→ Disclose buffer pool treatment, reversal provisions, and explicit CORSIA/CCP status, and resolve the contradictions between the validation report and PDD.

Documents Reviewed

- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- Listing Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report

Disclaimer

This Quality Report is an independent editorial assessment generated by CarbonMeld's automated analysis pipeline. It is based solely on publicly available registry documents and marketplace metadata at the time of analysis.

CarbonMeld does not have access to non-public project information, internal project documentation, or confidential communications with project developers. The analysis pipeline may not have retrieved all publicly available documents for this project.

This report does not constitute an audit, certification, financial recommendation, investment advice, or guarantee of environmental outcome. It does not replace professional due diligence by the buyer or any party relying on this information.

CarbonMeld is not a registry, certification body, or financial advisor. Scores reflect evidence available at the time of analysis and may change as new documentation becomes available. CarbonMeld shall not be liable for any decision to purchase, sell, trade, or otherwise transact carbon credits based in whole or in part on the scores or content of this report.

Report ID: CM-32C13438 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-08 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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