QUALITY REPORT

Xinjiang A’letai Hua’ning Hydropower Project

CDM-4744b9 · CDM Standard · China

Report ID: CM-6F1DD892 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.6
Transparency (25%)	5.2
Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
Documentation (15%)	6.6

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

Assessment Summary

This CDM hydropower project uses a standard grid-displacement methodology (ACM0002) with VVB involvement and no reported material findings, which supports basic MRV credibility. However, key integrity elements are weakly evidenced in the extracted record, including leakage treatment, baseline reassessment timing, and inconsistent statements on additionality approach and safeguards across documents.

Project Details

Registry	CDM Standard
Registry ID	CDM-4744b9
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2013
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.3.0
Crediting Period	2013 — 2020
VVB	CEPREI Certification Body
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Contradictory additionality test type between the validation report (investment test) and the monitoring report (barrier analysis), raising reliability concerns.

■ Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record and no leakage deduction is stated, despite being a core integrity element to document.

■ Safeguards are inconsistently described across documents and FPIC/grievance mechanism/benefit sharing are not evidenced.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality is stated as confirmed by the VVB, and no material findings or corrective actions are reported in the monitoring record (monitoring report, 2021).

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated; leakage is not addressed and no deduction is provided in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2021).

The project applies ACM0002 with a project-specific baseline and reports a grid emission factor of 0.7926 (monitoring report, 2021), which is consistent with standard grid-displacement accounting. Additionality is indicated as confirmed by the VVB, and the monitoring record shows no material findings or corrective actions (monitoring report, 2021). However, leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not provided in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2021), which weakens robustness.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ Monitoring and crediting periods are clearly specified (2013-07-01 to 2020-06-30) and key parameters like the grid emission factor are reported (monitoring report, 2021).

- Total emission reductions claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record, limiting traceability of issued outcomes (monitoring report, 2021).

The monitoring period and crediting period are clearly stated as 2013-07-01 to 2020-06-30 (monitoring report, 2021), supporting temporal transparency. The VVB is identified as CEPREI Certification Body (monitoring report, 2021). But the extracted record does not include total emission reductions claimed or verified, limiting the ability to reconcile calculations to outcomes from the available extracted fields (monitoring report, 2021).

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (monitoring report, 2021).

- Contradictions on additionality approach and missing quantified ER claimed/verified increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk (validation report, 2012; monitoring report, 2021).

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of higher-stakes aviation claims (monitoring report, 2021). Nonetheless, over-crediting/claim risk is elevated because the extracted record lacks the total ER claimed and verified and because the additionality approach is inconsistent across documents (validation report, 2012; monitoring report, 2021). CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity voluntary-claim alignment.

Documentation — 6.6 / 10

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

- Some key fields are missing or not evidenced in the extracted record (e.g., ER claimed/verified, baseline reassessment, leakage deduction), indicating incomplete extractable documentation.

The evidence set includes a monitoring report (dated 2021-09-10), a PDD, and a validation report, with five documents used and high extraction confidence, which supports document reliability overall. However, several important quantitative and procedural elements are not found in the extracted record (e.g., ER claimed/verified, leakage deduction, baseline reassessment timing), indicating documentation completeness gaps for scoring purposes.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed but test type inconsistent across documents
Permanence	Avoidance project type with no reversal events evidenced
Leakage	Leakage not addressed and no deduction evidenced
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not evidenced
Safeguards	No FPIC or grievance mechanism evidenced; safeguards inconsistently reported
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide (or extract) the verified and claimed total emission reductions for the monitoring period, with calculation spreadsheets and VVB verification statements to enable reconciliation.

→ Clarify leakage treatment explicitly under ACM0002 for this hydropower context (including any applicable deduction or justification for zero) and document baseline reassessment/parameter update procedures.

→ Resolve the additionality-test inconsistency by citing the definitive additionality assessment from the validation/registration package and ensuring consistent referencing in monitoring/verification documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- Appendix 2 - IRR spreadsheet_Xinjiang A’letai Hua’ning Hydropower Project
- 01 Jul 2013 - 30 Jun 2020
- registration request form
- Appendix 1 - ER spreadsheet_Xinjiang A’letai Hua’ning Hydropower Project
- approval
- project design document
- 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-6F1DD892 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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