QUALITY REPORT

Zhangjiagang Nature Gas Power Generation Project

VCS-494 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-AA704845 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
5.9 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.6
	Transparency (25%)	6.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality (investment test) and a quantified approach to leakage is referenced in monitoring, but key quantitative elements (claimed ERs, leakage deduction, baseline reassessment timing) are missing from the extracted record. A corrective action on the natural gas CO2 emission factor indicates a real over-crediting risk if not corrected. Safeguards and grievance provisions are not evidenced in the available documents, increasing non-carbon integrity and reputational risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-494
Sector	other
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AM0029 03
Crediting Period	2009 — 2016
VVB	Det Norske Veritas
Verified ERs	2,707,872 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2005 — 2009
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Corrective action required to fix an incorrect natural gas CO_2 emission factor in the monitoring report and ER calculation sheet, which could materially affect credited reductions.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (PDD does not address leakage, while the monitoring report says leakage was quantified).
- No leakage deduction percentage and no total claimed ERs found in the extracted record, limiting independent checks of issuance accuracy.
- Safeguards, FPIC, and grievance mechanism are not evidenced in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

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

- The monitoring report required a correction to the natural gas CO_2 emission factor and ER calculation sheet, creating over-crediting risk if not resolved.

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 (2010) includes a corrective action because the natural gas CO_2 emission factor used (54.3 tCO_2/TJ) was not consistent with the registered PDD and required applying the IPCC 2006 default value, implying potential miscalculation of ERs until corrected. Leakage is described as quantified in the monitoring report (2010), but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record. No material findings are reported, but the presence of a corrective action still weakens confidence in the ER calculation quality.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ A named VVB (Det Norske Veritas) and a defined monitoring period (2005-06-08 to 2009-09-10) are provided in the monitoring report.

- Total claimed ERs and the leakage deduction percentage are not found in the extracted record, reducing MRV traceability.

The monitoring report (2010) clearly states the monitoring period (2005-06-08 to 2009-09-10) and identifies the VVB as Det Norske Veritas, supporting basic audit traceability. However, total claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record, while total verified ERs are reported as 2,707,872, limiting the ability to reconcile what was requested versus what was issued. Leakage is said to be quantified, but without a stated deduction percentage, the MRV trail is incomplete. Extraction confidence is high and multiple document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report), which supports a mid-to-good transparency score despite gaps.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Baseline is project-specific and key parameters (e.g., leakage deduction and baseline reassessment timing) are missing or inconsistent across documents.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of higher-stakes aviation claims being made from these credits. Over-crediting risk is elevated by the monitoring report (2010) corrective action requiring correction of the natural gas CO_2 emission factor and ER calculation sheet. The baseline approach is project-specific (as stated in the extracted record), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not found, which increases uncertainty about baseline conservativeness over time. Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, further increasing claim risk.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- Safeguards-related documentation (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) is not evidenced in the extracted record.

Key document types are present in the extracted record (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, indicating the underlying documents were readable enough for reliable extraction. The monitoring report (2010) provides specific corrective action text, which is a strong documentation signal even though it flags a problem. Safeguards-related elements are not evidenced (no FPIC, no grievance mechanism, no benefit sharing described), suggesting either missing documentation or absence of these processes in project design. Some important quantitative fields (total claimed ERs, leakage deduction percentage, baseline reassessment date) are not found in the extracted record, reducing completeness.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No reversal risk indicated for power generation
● **Leakage**	Quantified claimed but deduction not stated
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment not evidenced
● **Safeguards**	No FPIC/grievance evidence found
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the total claimed ERs, the final corrected ER calculation sheet, and the final applied natural gas CO2 emission factor consistent with the registered PDD/IPCC 2006 defaults.

→ Provide explicit leakage results including the leakage deduction percentage and a clear cross-reference showing how leakage was treated consistently from the PDD through monitoring.

→ Add publicly available safeguards documentation (stakeholder consultation outcomes, FPIC where relevant, and a functioning grievance mechanism) to reduce reputational and social-risk concerns.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-AA704845 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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