

QUALITY REPORT

DG Xingyao PV Project

CT-446 · I-REC · China

Report ID: CM-2F6C7078 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

Only minimal project metadata was provided, with no extracted content from official documents to substantiate baseline setting, additionality, monitoring, or issuance details. Given the low readability flag and zero documents used, the project’s credit quality cannot be validated from the available record, creating high uncertainty and elevated over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	CT-446
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2022
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No official project documents were extracted or referenced (0 documents used), so key quality determinants (baseline, additionality, MRV, leakage) cannot be verified
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or misread critical information

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions are not found in the extracted record because no documents were used

~ Renewable energy avoidance projects can be straightforward, but integrity cannot be assessed without the monitoring/verification record

No project documents were extracted (0 documents used), so additionality testing, baseline method selection, leakage treatment, and any material findings or corrective actions are not stated in available documents. For a renewable electricity project, integrity hinges on credible baseline/grid factor inputs and robust MRV, but these are not found in the extracted record. As a result, the risk of unvalidated assumptions and over-crediting is high.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or error checking (claimed vs verified) information is available in the extracted record

- Registry/public documentation completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no verification/monitoring reports, no VVB name, and no monitoring period information. Without claimed-versus-verified error rates or MRV descriptions, it is not possible to assess data quality controls. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the public record has been captured accurately.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline method and grid/emissions factor inputs are not stated in available documents

~ Eligibility/labels (e.g., CORSIA/CCP) are not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims

Claim safety is weak because the extracted record does not include the baseline method, grid emissions factor approach, or any checks on generation/usage monitoring that would support credible avoidance claims. CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so downstream claim constraints cannot be confirmed. With no extracted evidence, the project is exposed to greenwashing risk due to unverifiable crediting assumptions.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- No evidence documents were extracted (0 documents used), indicating severe documentation gaps

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues that undermine reliance on the record

Documentation quality is very poor: no evidence documents are listed and no documents were used for extraction. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable, which increases the likelihood of missing critical details. These gaps prevent a defensible assessment of the project's quality.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Avoidance type, but reversal/buffer not documented
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide and extract the core I-REC documentation (registration, monitoring/production evidence, verification/assurance statement) including the monitoring period, auditor/VVB, and any findings/corrective actions
- Disclose the baseline/grid emissions factor approach and MRV procedures (metering, data QA/QC, error checks) and clearly state any eligibility/label status relevant to claims (e.g., CORSIA/CCP or equivalent)

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-2F6C7078 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy