

QUALITY REPORT

Qinghai Maqin Gequ Level 2 Hydropower Station

CDM-57f4f1 · CDM Standard · China

Report ID: CM-AC08EF17 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.6

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

Assessment Summary

This CDM hydropower project has VVB-confirmed additionality and uses an established grid-connected renewable methodology (ACM0002), but key integrity parameters (leakage deduction, baseline reassessment timing, permanence/buffer approach) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record. A major inconsistency in verified emission reductions across monitoring reports increases over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	CDM Standard
Registry ID	CDM-57f4f1
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2015
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.3.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2020
VVB	CEPREI Certification Body
Verified ERs	1,143,924 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2015 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large contradiction in verified emission reductions between monitoring reports (1,143,924 vs 276,440.2), raising data reliability and over-crediting concerns
- Leakage treatment is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record
- Safeguards elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism) are not evidenced in the extracted record

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation documentation referenced in the extracted record).
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

The validation documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, supporting additionality robustness. The project applies ACM0002 (version 12.3.0) with a project-specific baseline approach, but the extracted record does not state when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens baseline credibility over time. Leakage is described as quantified, yet the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty on whether leakage was conservatively treated. No reversal events are reported in the extracted record, and as an avoidance renewable project, permanence risk is generally lower, but no buffer approach is documented.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + Key MRV elements are present (named VVB and a defined monitoring period of 2015-10-01 to 2020-12-31 in the monitoring report dated 2021-08-05).
- Conflicting verified ER figures across documents reduce confidence in reported outcomes.

The monitoring report dated 2021-08-05 provides a clear monitoring period (2015-10-01 to 2020-12-31) and identifies the VVB as CEPREI Certification Body, which supports traceability. However, the extracted record shows a major inconsistency in verified emission reductions between monitoring reports, which undermines MRV clarity and comparability. No usage monitoring method is found in the extracted record, limiting insight into how generation/dispatch data quality was assured. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, but the ER inconsistency still indicates a transparency weakness.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.
- Contradictory verified ER totals and missing leakage deduction details elevate over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-impact aviation claims. Over-crediting risk is elevated by the contradiction in verified ER totals across monitoring reports and by the gap between claimed and verified totals in the extracted record (930,486 claimed vs 1,143,924 verified), which warrants careful reconciliation. Leakage is said to be quantified, but without the leakage deduction percentage in the extracted record, it is hard to judge conservativeness. CCP status is not stated in available documents, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks.

Documentation — 6.6 / 10

- + Multiple core document types are evidenced (issuance, validation report, monitoring report) with 5 documents used and medium extraction confidence.
- CCP status and several key quantitative fields (e.g., leakage deduction %, baseline reassessment date) are not found in the extracted record.

The extracted record includes issuance, a validation report, and monitoring reports, with 5 documents used and medium extraction confidence, indicating a reasonably complete document set. Still, several key fields are not found in the extracted record (e.g., leakage deduction percentage, baseline reassessment date, buffer pool percentage, usage monitoring method), which limits auditability of core assumptions. Safeguards-related evidence is weak in the extracted record (no FPIC, no grievance mechanism, and safeguards not mentioned). Overall documentation quality is moderate but not strong enough to fully resolve the noted inconsistencies.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals evidenced
● Leakage	Quantified in narrative; deduction not evidenced
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	No FPIC/grievance evidence in record
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the exact leakage deduction calculation and percentage applied for the monitoring period, with references to the monitoring report tables/annexes.

→ Reconcile and explain the verified ER discrepancy between the 2015 and 2021 monitoring reports (scope, period coverage, revisions), and publish a clear ER time series by year/monitoring period.

Documents Reviewed

- registration request form
- Appendix 2 - ER spreadsheet_Qinghai Maqin Gequ Level 2 hydropower station
- Appendix 1 - IRR spreadsheet_Qinghai Maqin Gequ Level 2 hydropower station
- 01 Jan 2014 - 30 Sep 2015
- approval
- 01 Oct 2015 - 31 Dec 2020
- 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-AC08EF17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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