

QUALITY REPORT

28MW Jinkouba Hydropower Project

CDM-1633 · CDM · China

Report ID: CM-AE522B93 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	3.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	3.1

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

Assessment Summary

This CDM hydropower project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings in the validation report. However, key risk controls are weakly documented: leakage is not addressed in the validation record, reversal risk is not discussed, and the extraction confidence is low, which reduces trust in the completeness of the evidence.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CDM-1633
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 06
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2012
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is not addressed in the validation report, while a later document reportedly described it as negligible; the more specific and dated validation report was privileged, but the inconsistency lowers confidence.
- The crediting period is inconsistent across documents, with the validation report showing one period and a later document showing a different one, which raises documentation reliability concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the validation report records no material findings.
- Leakage is not addressed in the validation report, and reversal events are not addressed in the extracted record.

The validation report from TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program confirms additionality through a combined test and reports no material findings or corrective actions. That said, leakage is not addressed in the validation report, reversal events are not addressed, and no buffer pool information is available, which weakens the permanence and leakage profile. The project is a hydropower avoidance project, so reversal risk is lower than for land-use projects, but the documentation still leaves important gaps.

Transparency — 3.8 / 10

- + The project has a named validation body and a defined monitoring period in the validation record.
- Verified versus claimed emission reductions are not available in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is low.

The project has a clear validation body and a stated monitoring period, which supports basic traceability. However, the extracted record does not provide claimed or verified emission reduction totals, usage monitoring details, or registry completeness indicators, so public MRV transparency appears limited. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the available documentation is complete.

Claim Safety — 4.4 / 10

- + The project uses ACM0002 under the CDM, which is a recognized methodology for grid-connected renewable power.
- Leakage justification is missing in the validation report, and there is no evidence in the extracted record on CORSIA or CCP status.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a standard CDM methodology for renewable electricity and has VVB-confirmed additionality. Still, the absence of a documented leakage treatment in the validation report and the lack of evidence on CORSIA or CCP status leave residual over-crediting and dual-claim uncertainty. The later note that leakage was deemed negligible is less persuasive than the validation report's explicit lack of treatment, so the more specific validation record was privileged.

Documentation — 3.1 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, and the validation report is dated.
- The extraction confidence is low, and there are contradictions on additionality test type, leakage treatment, and crediting period.

Documentation quality is mixed: there are multiple official documents and a dated validation report, but the extraction confidence is low and several key fields are missing. The record also contains contradictions on the additionality test type, leakage justification, and crediting period; the validation report was privileged because it is the primary certification document and is dated earlier than the conflicting later extract. These inconsistencies materially reduce confidence in the completeness and reliability of the file.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC noted, grievance mechanism not stated
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full monitoring report and verification statement with claimed and verified issuance figures, leakage treatment, and any corrective action closure.

→ Publish a clear registry trail and eligibility statement covering CORSIA/CCP status, plus a consistent crediting-period record across all official documents.

Documents Reviewed

- registration request form
- Appendix 3 - Jinkouba_CDM_Evidence
- 27 Feb 2010 - 26 Feb 2011
- approval
- Appendix 1 - Jinkouba IRR and Investment corrected
- 27 Feb 2011 - 26 Feb 2012
- Appendix 2 - Jinkouba_Supplementary_CDM_Evidence
- 18 Feb 2009 - 26 Feb 2010
- 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-AE522B93 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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