QUALITY REPORT

Guangdong Huizhou LNG Power Generation Project

VCS-722 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-E6C875D2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10		
	Integrity (35%)	5.6
	Transparency (25%)	6.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project's quantified emissions reductions were fully matched between claimed and verified totals, and additionality was confirmed via an investment test. However, key integrity elements are incompletely evidenced in the extracted record (notably leakage deduction value, baseline reassessment timing, and permanence/buffer provisions), and there are document inconsistencies on safeguards and the crediting period.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-722
Sector	other
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AM0029 01.1
Crediting Period	2008 — 2009
VVB	Huang-Zhanxun
Verified ERs	1,419,794 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2006 — 2008
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Crediting period is inconsistent between the monitoring report and the PDD, creating uncertainty about the exact crediting timeline.
- ■ Leakage is described as quantified but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Safeguards reporting is inconsistent across documents (validation report vs monitoring report), and FPIC/grievance mechanism are not evidenced.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

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

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents; leakage deduction value is also not found in the extracted record.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record). The baseline approach is project-specific (PDD), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens confidence in baseline robustness over time. Leakage is described as quantified (monitoring report), but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to judge whether leakage was conservatively treated. Permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool) and any reversal events are not evidenced in the extracted record, leaving a gap even if reversal risk is typically low for this project type.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ Claimed and verified emissions reductions are identical (1,419,794), indicating no quantified discrepancy in the verification outcome.

- Several MRV-relevant fields are missing from the extracted record (e.g., grid EF year, leakage deduction percent, usage monitoring method).

The monitoring report shows total claimed emissions reductions of 1,419,794 and the verified total is also 1,419,794, suggesting the verification outcome did not adjust the headline quantity (monitoring report/issuance as reflected in the extracted record). The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2006-08-21 to 2008-09-30 (monitoring report). However, several important MRV details are not found in the extracted record, including the grid emission factor year, the leakage deduction percentage, and the usage monitoring method, which reduces transparency for independent replication.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

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

- Over-crediting risk cannot be well assessed because the baseline is project-specific and key parameters (e.g., baseline reassessment timing and leakage deduction) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible (registry/extracted record), which lowers the risk of dual-channel claims in aviation contexts. At the same time, CCP status is not stated in available documents, so alignment with higher-integrity labels cannot be confirmed. Over-crediting risk remains moderately uncertain because the baseline is project-specific (PDD) and the extracted record does not provide the baseline reassessment timing or the quantified leakage deduction value, both of which matter for conservative crediting.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Multiple core document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Corrective actions were required (e.g., LoA request and parameter inclusions), and contradictions across documents reduce reliability.

The extracted record includes key document types (monitoring report dated 2009-08-03, validation report dated 2009-04-22, PDD dated 2009-06-26, and issuance), and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting document usability. The monitoring/verification process identified corrective actions (e.g., request for Letter of Approval and inclusion of key parameters such as Build Margin and coal-related parameters), indicating earlier documentation gaps that needed remediation (monitoring/verification documentation). Contradictions across documents (safeguards mention and crediting period) reduce confidence in the consistency of the record.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
● **Leakage**	Quantified but deduction value missing
● **Baseline**	Project-specific; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Inconsistent safeguards evidence; no FPIC/grievance
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the quantified leakage deduction (percent and calculation) in the monitoring/verification record and ensure it is consistently reported across documents.

→ Resolve and publicly clarify the crediting period discrepancy (PDD vs monitoring report) with an authoritative registry/issuance timeline reference, and standardize safeguards reporting (including FPIC and a grievance mechanism).

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification 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-E6C875D2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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