QUALITY REPORT

Luofan 24MW Hydropower Project In Guizhou Province China

VCS-1148 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-DEC616FE · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.5 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project reports consistent quantified emission reductions, with the verified and claimed totals matching in the monitoring/verification record. However, key integrity elements are weakly evidenced in the extracted record—especially leakage treatment and baseline reassessment—while safeguards information is inconsistent across documents, increasing reputational and over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1148
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 14.0.0
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
VVB	China Classification Society Certification Company
Verified ERs	95,624 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record, despite ACM0002 projects typically needing an explicit leakage statement.

■ Safeguards coverage is contradictory between the PDD and the monitoring report, reducing confidence in social risk management disclosures.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification record).

- Leakage treatment is missing/unclear (monitoring report shows leakage not addressed and no deduction stated).

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. The baseline is project-specific under ACM0002, but the extracted record does not state when (or if) the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens confidence over a long crediting period. Leakage is a key gap: the monitoring record indicates leakage was not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, which is a material integrity uncertainty for an avoidance crediting approach.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Claimed and verified ERs match at 95,624 tCO2e for the monitoring period (monitoring/verification record).

- Baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents, limiting MRV traceability over time.

The monitoring period is clearly specified (2011-12-05 to 2013-08-25) and the claimed ERs equal the verified ERs at 95,624 tCO2e in the monitoring/verification record, which is a positive MRV consistency signal. The VVB is identified (China Classification Society Certification Company), supporting audit traceability. However, several MRV-relevant fields are not found in the extracted record (e.g., baseline reassessment timing and some monitoring-method specifics), reducing transparency completeness.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (registry record).

- Project-specific baseline and missing leakage treatment increase perceived over-crediting/greenwashing risk (PDD/monitoring record).

CORSIA eligibility is explicitly false, which lowers the risk of dual-channel marketing claims tied to CORSIA. At the same time, the baseline is project-specific and leakage is not addressed in the extracted monitoring record, both of which elevate perceived over-crediting risk for external claim-making. CCP status is not stated in available documents, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity labels and how claims might be interpreted by buyers.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- Internal inconsistency on safeguards disclosure indicates documentation reliability issues (PDD vs monitoring report).

The extracted record includes the key document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting document completeness and readability. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is supportive but depends on the completeness of the underlying reports. A notable weakness is an internal inconsistency on safeguards disclosure between documents, which reduces confidence in the reliability of non-carbon disclosures.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; reversal risk not material
Leakage	Leakage not addressed; deduction not stated
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards disclosure inconsistent across documents
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide an explicit leakage assessment consistent with ACM0002 (including a quantified leakage deduction if applicable) in the monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Resolve safeguards disclosure inconsistency by publishing a clear safeguards section (FPIC, grievance mechanism, stakeholder engagement outcomes) consistently across the PDD and monitoring reports.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report

Report ID: CM-DEC616FE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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