

QUALITY REPORT

Panjin Rice Husk Thermal Energy Generation Project

VCS-528 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-A94C14DA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.5Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
■ Transparency (25%)	6.4
■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.8
■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS biomass energy project has VVB-confirmed additionality (barrier test) and a quantified verified emission reduction total for the monitoring period. However, leakage is only described as “deemed negligible” without a stated deduction, and key baseline governance details (like reassessment timing) are not evidenced in the extracted record. Safeguards reporting is inconsistent across documents, which increases reliability and reputational risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-528
Sector	biomass
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.C version 16
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Verified ERs	50,691 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Leakage is treated as “deemed negligible” but no leakage deduction percentage is stated in the extracted record.
- Safeguards coverage is inconsistent between the PDD and the monitoring report, creating uncertainty about social/environmental risk management.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ The validation/verification chain includes Bureau Veritas Certification and additionality is confirmed via a barrier test (monitoring report, 2014).

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents (monitoring report, 2014; PDD, 2010).

The monitoring report (2014) indicates additionality was assessed using a barrier test and confirmed by the VVB (Bureau Veritas Certification), supporting additionality robustness. The baseline approach is project-specific (monitoring report, 2014), and no baseline reassessment date is stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence that baseline parameters stayed conservative over time. Leakage is described as “deemed negligible” (monitoring report, 2014) but without a stated leakage deduction, leaving a material integrity uncertainty for biomass feedstock sourcing and market effects.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

+ The monitoring period and verified ERs are clearly stated (50,691 tCO₂e for 2009-10-19 to 2012-12-31) in the monitoring report (2014).

- Several MRV-relevant fields are not found in the extracted record (e.g., claimed ERs, grid EF year, usage monitoring method), limiting auditability.

The monitoring report (2014) provides a clear monitoring period (2009-10-19 to 2012-12-31) and a verified ER total of 50,691 tCO₂e, and it reports no material findings or corrective actions. However, the extracted record does not include the claimed ER total, preventing an easy claimed-versus-verified comparison. Several other transparency-relevant details (e.g., grid EF year and usage monitoring method) are not found in the extracted record, limiting independent reproducibility.

Claim Safety — 6.8 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim and double-claim channel risk (merged record).

- Over-crediting risk is harder to rule out because leakage is not quantified and baseline reassessment timing is not evidenced in the extracted record.

The merged record states the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of problematic aviation-related claims. CCP status is not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot rely on CCP screening from the extracted record. Claim safety is moderated by potential over-crediting uncertainty because leakage is only qualitatively addressed (“deemed negligible”) and baseline reassessment timing is not evidenced in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2014; PDD, 2010).

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

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

- Contradictions between documents on safeguards mention and crediting period reduce confidence in document consistency.

Documentation coverage is reasonably strong: the evidence set includes a PDD (2010), validation report (2010), and monitoring report (2014), and extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report (2014) shows no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports procedural completeness. Still, internal consistency issues (noted in the contradictions list) reduce documentation reliability and warrant a conservative scoring adjustment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Negligible claim without quantified deduction
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Inconsistent safeguards reporting
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a quantified leakage assessment (or explicit 0% deduction with a documented, project-specific justification and evidence on biomass feedstock sourcing).

→ Resolve administrative inconsistencies by publishing a clear, reconciled crediting period statement across registry, validation, and monitoring documentation, and consistently report safeguards/grievance provisions in monitoring.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-A94C14DA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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