QUALITY REPORT

Ziqiang 18MW Hydropower Project In Guizhou Province China

VCS-1044 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-5C0F0A35 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.1
	Transparency (25%)	5.0
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, no material findings were reported, and the issuance record shows claimed and verified emissions reductions match exactly. However, reliability is weakened by document contradictions on safeguards, leakage treatment, and the crediting period, and several key MRV details are not stated in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1044
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.3.0
Crediting Period	2010 — 2012
VVB	China Classification Society Certification Company
Verified ERs	62,780 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- The extracted record contains contradictions on safeguards, leakage justification, and the crediting period, which reduces confidence in the documentation trail.
- Safeguards, grievance mechanism, FPIC, and usage monitoring details are not found in the available documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports the project case.

- Leakage treatment is only described as deemed negligible, while one earlier document reportedly said it was not addressed; the crediting period also conflicts across documents.

The issuance report shows additionality was confirmed by the VVB through an investment test, and no material findings or corrective actions were reported. The project is an avoidance project, so reversal risk is lower than for removals, but buffer pool coverage is not stated and there are no reversal details in the extracted record. Leakage is described as deemed negligible, yet the contradiction log says an earlier document treated leakage as not addressed, which weakens confidence in the integrity case.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ The issuance record reports 62,780 verified reductions, matching the amount claimed, which supports registry consistency.

- Key monitoring details such as the usage monitoring method and verification of usage rates are not stated in the extracted record.

The registry record shows 62,780 verified reductions and the same amount claimed, which is a positive sign for issuance consistency. However, the usage monitoring method is not found, usage rates are not verified, and the extracted record does not provide a public-facing level of MRV detail beyond the issuance summary. The medium extraction confidence also limits transparency confidence somewhat.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The verified and claimed emission reductions are identical, which reduces immediate over-issuance concern in the issuance record.

- The project is not CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated and the baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized approach.

Claim safety is helped by the exact match between claimed and verified reductions in the issuance record. Still, the baseline is project-specific, the leakage justification is contested across documents, and CCP status is not stated, so the risk of over-crediting cannot be dismissed. The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of claim risk but does not resolve the broader quality concerns.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ Nine documents were used and no material findings or corrective actions were reported in the issuance record.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and several important items are not found in the available documents, including buffer pool coverage and safeguard documentation.

The record draws on nine documents, and the issuance report is dated 2013-06-17, which is reasonably close to the monitoring period. Even so, extraction confidence is only medium, one evidence document is listed as unknown, and several core items are missing or not stated, including buffer pool coverage, safeguard documentation, and monitoring method details. The contradictions on safeguards, leakage, and crediting period further reduce documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	avoidance project, buffer not stated
Leakage	negligible claim, conflicting record
Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	no safeguards or grievance evidence
Double-claim	not CORSIA-eligible, CCP not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full monitoring and verification package showing leakage treatment, safeguard implementation, and the rationale for the final crediting period.

→ Disclose buffer pool treatment, any reversal monitoring provisions, and a clear registry statement on CCP status and other claim restrictions.

Documents Reviewed

- PP_ISS_REP_1044_20DEC2010_22DEC2012.pdf
- MONIT_REP_1044_20DEC2010_22DEC2012.pdf
- PP_REG_REP_1044_17JUN2013.pdf
- COMMS_AGR_PL1044_17APR2013.pdf
- PROJ_DESC_1044_16OCT2012.pdf
- PROJ_DESC_1044_31MAR2013.pdf
- VERIF_REP_1044_20DEC2010_22DEC2012.pdf
- VERIF_STA_1044_20DEC2010_22DEC2012.pdf
- VALID_STA_1044_14JUN2013.pdf

Report ID: CM-5C0F0A35 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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