

QUALITY REPORT

Poechos II hydroelectric plant project

CNN-c0ea4d · Gold Standard · Peru

Report ID: CM-0DF92CDA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This grid-connected hydro project has VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings, which supports basic credit integrity. However, key quantification elements (notably grid emission factor and leakage deduction) are missing from the extracted record, and there are material inconsistencies across monitoring reports on verified ERs that increase over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-c0ea4d
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Peru
Vintage	2013
Project Methodology	ACM0002 06
Crediting Period	2009 — 2016
VVB	AENOR INTERNACIONAL, S.A.U.
Verified ERs	71,833 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Verified emission reductions conflict across monitoring reports (71,833 vs 103,856), undermining confidence in credited volumes.
- Grid emission factor and its vintage are not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess baseline robustness for ACM0002.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (validation report).
- Baseline quantification inputs (grid emission factor and reassessment timing) are not found in the extracted record, and leakage treatment is inconsistently documented (monitoring vs validation reports).

Additionality is reported as confirmed by the VVB, which supports integrity for an ACM0002 grid-connected renewable project (validation report). The baseline is described as project-specific, but the grid emission factor and the year/vintage used are not found in the extracted record, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is also not stated. Leakage is described as negligible in a monitoring report, yet the validation report indicates it was not addressed, which weakens confidence in consistent application of the methodology.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + A named VVB (AENOR INTERNACIONAL, S.A.U.) and a clearly stated monitoring period (2016-01-01 to 2016-03-31) are provided (monitoring report).
- Key MRV parameters are missing from the extracted record (grid emission factor, leakage deduction), and verified ER totals are inconsistent across monitoring reports.

The extracted record provides a clear monitoring period (2016-01-01 to 2016-03-31) and identifies the VVB as AENOR INTERNACIONAL, S.A.U. (monitoring report). However, core MRV inputs needed to reproduce results—especially the grid emission factor and any explicit leakage deduction—are not found in the extracted record. Transparency is further reduced by inconsistent verified ER totals reported across different monitoring reports.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (extracted record).
- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory verified ER figures across monitoring reports and missing baseline/leakage quantification in the extracted record.

The project is indicated as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of dual-channel claims in aviation contexts (extracted record). Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened by the contradiction in verified ER totals across monitoring reports and by missing baseline quantification (grid emission factor) in the extracted record, both of which increase perceived over-crediting risk. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

- + Multiple core document types are present (monitoring report, validation report, PDD) and extraction confidence is high (evidence list).
- The extracted record shows a safeguards documentation gap (no FPIC and no grievance mechanism reported), and one evidence document is of unknown type.

The evidence set includes key document types (monitoring report, validation report, and PDD) with a relatively high number of documents used (9) and high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation score. The latest extracted monitoring report date is 2022-07-12, while the monitoring period ends in 2016, indicating a long lag that can complicate traceability of decisions over time. Safeguards-related items appear weakly documented in the extracted record (no FPIC and no grievance mechanism reported), and one evidence document is listed as unknown type.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● Leakage	Negligible claimed but inconsistently documented
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; key parameters missing
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or extract the exact grid emission factor value(s), source, and applicable year(s) used under ACM0002, and document any baseline reassessment over the crediting period.

→ Reconcile the conflicting verified ER totals across monitoring reports with a clear issuance/verification table (by monitoring period) and provide an explicit leakage assessment and any deduction applied (even if 0%).

Documents Reviewed

- approval
- 01 Apr 2010 - 31 Mar 2013
- 01 Apr 2013 - 31 Dec 2015
- registration request form
- 01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016
- 01 Apr 2009 - 31 Mar 2010
- Appendix 1 - REVISION PDD POECHOS II with track change
- project design document
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- 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-0DF92CDA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy