

QUALITY REPORT

Qielong 1.2MW Hydro Power Project

GS-846 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-4BEDD181 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a small hydro project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reversal events reported, but the evidence base has several reliability issues. The main concerns are contradictory statements across documents on the additionality test, baseline method, leakage treatment, and crediting period, plus leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-846
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 GSV1.0 VER
Crediting Period	2010 — 2017
VVB	The Gold Standard Foundation
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- The monitoring report and validation report disagree on additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and crediting period, which weakens confidence in the record.
- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report even though the PDD reportedly treated it as negligible, creating uncertainty about over-crediting risk.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses the ACM0002 methodology under Gold Standard.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the monitoring report, and the record shows no buffer pool or reversal detail.

The verification report states that the project meets Gold Standard requirements and that additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which is a meaningful positive. However, the monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, and there is no buffer pool or reversal detail in the extracted record, so permanence and leakage controls are only partially supported. The project uses ACM0002, but the baseline and leakage treatment are not consistently documented across the available files.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

- + The verification report is identified, with a defined monitoring period and a named VVB, which supports basic traceability.
- Total ERs claimed versus verified are not stated, and the extraction confidence is only medium, limiting documentation clarity.

The record includes a named verifier, a monitoring period, and a verification report date, which helps traceability. Still, total emissions reductions claimed versus verified are not stated, usage monitoring is not described, and the extraction confidence is only medium, so the public MRV picture is incomplete. The absence of several quantified fields limits transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + The project is a small hydro renewable-energy activity with VVB-confirmed additionality, which supports a moderate claim-safety profile.
- The monitoring report leaves leakage unaddressed, and the project is listed as CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not mentioned, leaving dual-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is a small hydro renewable-energy activity and additionality was confirmed by the VVB. That said, the monitoring report does not address leakage, while the PDD reportedly considered it negligible, so the over-crediting risk is not fully resolved. The project is marked as CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not mentioned, leaving some dual-claim uncertainty.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, including the PDD, validation report, verification report, and monitoring report.
- Several key fields are not stated in the extracted record, and the monitoring period ends in 2013 while the verification report is dated 2014, indicating only moderate recency.

Documentation quality is fair because multiple official documents were available and 15 extracted facts were used. The verification report is reasonably detailed, but several important fields are missing or not stated, including verified ER totals, leakage quantification, and usage monitoring. The monitoring period is older than the verification date, and the medium extraction confidence suggests at least one source was not perfectly readable.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal detail or buffer pool stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed in monitoring report
● Baseline	Project baseline with reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not mentioned

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled document trail explaining the differences between the validation report, monitoring report, and verification report on additionality, baseline, leakage, and crediting period.

→ Publish quantified leakage treatment, verified emissions reduction totals, and clearer registry/claim status information, including whether CCP approval exists.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_05-04-2010 to 25-03-13_v2.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_05-04-2010 to 25-03-13_v2.pdf
- (1)GS Passport_24-06-10.pdf
- GS Passport_24-06-10.pdf
- PDD_19-06-2012.pdf
- (1)PDD_19-06-2012.pdf
- PDD_24-12-2010.pdf
- PDD_27-12-2011.pdf
- PDD_19-06-12.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-846
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-846
- GS Validation Report_21.06.2012.pdf
- GS Validation Report_07.10.2012_v3.pdf
- (1)GS Validation Report_07.10.2012_v3.pdf
- (1)GS Validation Report_21.06.2012.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_05-04-2010 to 25-03-2013.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_05-04-2010 to 25-03-2013.pdf

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-4BEDD181 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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