QUALITY REPORT

Jilin Rice Husk Thermal Energy Generation Project

VCS-529 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-6D2B5886 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

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

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS biomass energy project has a VVB-confirmed additionality assessment and a clean verification outcome with no material findings, which supports basic credit integrity. However, key quantification elements (notably leakage deduction and baseline reassessment timing) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and safeguards reporting is inconsistent across documents.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-529
Sector	biomass
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.C 16
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Verified ERs	26,378 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is described as “deemed negligible” but no leakage deduction percentage is provided in the extracted record.
- ■ Safeguards are inconsistently reported between the PDD (mentions safeguards) and the monitoring report (does not).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the record).

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed using a barrier analysis and confirmed by the VVB (Bureau Veritas Certification). The monitoring/verification outcome shows no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports procedural integrity. However, the baseline is described as project-specific and the extracted record does not state when (or whether) the baseline was last reassessed, which increases over-crediting risk over time. Leakage is only described as negligible in the monitoring report, but the absence of a stated leakage deduction percentage weakens confidence in completeness of the accounting.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Claimed and verified ERs match (26,378 tCO■e) in the monitoring/verification record.

- Key MRV parameters (e.g., grid emission factor and its vintage) are not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring period is clearly stated (2009-12-10 to 2012-12-31) and the monitoring report shows the same total emission reductions claimed and verified (26,378 tCO■e), which is a positive transparency signal. The VVB is identified as Bureau Veritas Certification, supporting traceability of assurance. At the same time, key quantitative inputs commonly needed to reproduce results (such as the grid emission factor and the year/vintage used) are not found in the extracted record, limiting independent replicability. Usage monitoring details are also not stated in available documents.

Claim Safety — 6.5 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim overlap risk.

- Leakage treatment is not fully evidenced (negligible claimed, but no quantified deduction shown).

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, which lowers the risk of conflicting claims in the aviation context. No CCP status is found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity buyer claims tied to CCP. The baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, which can elevate over-crediting risk if grid or technology conditions changed during the crediting period. Leakage is asserted as negligible in the monitoring report without a quantified deduction, which increases greenwashing/over-crediting risk if leakage pathways exist but were not robustly evidenced.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- Safeguards documentation is inconsistent across documents, reducing reliability.

The extracted record indicates availability of core documents (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and uses multiple documents overall, with high extraction confidence, supporting document completeness. The monitoring report is dated 2013-12-30 and covers a defined monitoring period, suggesting reasonable recency for the issuance vintage assessed. No corrective actions or material findings are reported, which is consistent with a complete verification package. However, safeguards reporting is inconsistent between documents, which reduces confidence that non-carbon requirements were consistently addressed and disclosed.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed barrier analysis
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● **Leakage**	Negligible claimed; deduction not evidenced
● **Baseline**	Project-specific; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Inconsistent safeguards disclosure
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and justify a quantified leakage assessment (including an explicit leakage deduction of 0% if applicable) in the monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Provide the grid emission factor value and the year/vintage (and any updates/reassessments) used for the monitoring period to enable independent replication.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-6D2B5886 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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