

QUALITY REPORT

# Fujian Yong’An Improved Forest Management Project

VCS-1577 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-451C89E1 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

|                                                              |                       |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| <div>5.5</div> <div>Overall Score</div> <div>out of 10</div> | ■ Integrity (35%)     | 3.9 |
|                                                              | ■ Transparency (25%)  | 6.2 |
|                                                              | ■ Claim Safety (25%)  | 6.0 |
|                                                              | ■ Documentation (15%) | 7.1 |
|                                                              |                       |     |

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

## Assessment Summary

This IFM project shows some core integrity strengths (VVB-confirmed additionality, a 25% buffer contribution, and no reversals reported), but key risk areas are weakly evidenced. Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction while the justification is inconsistent across monitoring reports, and a corrective action on forest stratification raises MRV reliability concerns.

## Project Details

|                     |                       |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Registry            | Verra (VCS)           |
| Registry ID         | VCS-1577              |
| Sector              | redd                  |
| Country             | China                 |
| Vintage             | Stale                 |
| Project Methodology | VM0010 1.2            |
| Crediting Period    | 2011 — 2031           |
| VVB                 | CQC                   |
| Verified ERs        | 287,276 tCO2e         |
| Monitoring Period   | 2016 — 2021           |
| Confidence          | Medium                |
| Documents Reviewed  | 18 documents reviewed |
| Scored              | 2026-04-02            |

## Red Flags

- Leakage is deducted at 0% while leakage justification is inconsistent across monitoring reports (negligible vs not addressed).
- Corrective action (CAR01) indicates inconsistencies in forest stratification versus inventory evidence, increasing over-crediting risk.
- Safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing are contradicted between the validation report and the later monitoring report, reducing confidence in social safeguard claims.
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 3.9 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification record; VVB: CQC).
- Leakage is treated as 0% with weak/inconsistent justification across documents, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (CQC), which supports additionality robustness. Permanence provisions appear reasonably strong for a VCS IFM project, with a 25% buffer contribution and no reversals reported in the monitoring report (2022-06-01). However, leakage is deducted at 0% while the monitoring record does not consistently justify why leakage is negligible, and the baseline is project-specific with no baseline reassessment date found in the extracted record—both weaken integrity.

### Transparency — 6.2 / 10

- + Monitoring period and verified ERs are clearly stated (monitoring report dated 2022-06-01 reports 2016-07-01—2021-06-30 and 287,276 tCO<sub>2</sub>e verified).
- Claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record, and CAR01 suggests data quality issues in stratification/inventory inputs.

The monitoring report (2022-06-01) provides a clear monitoring period (2016-07-01—2021-06-30) and a verified ER figure of 287,276 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, which supports MRV transparency. At the same time, the claimed ER figure is not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to reconcile claims versus verification. The presence of CAR01 in the monitoring/verification package indicates the auditor found inconsistencies in stratification versus forest investigation data, which reduces confidence in the underlying activity data transparency.

### Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (registry extract).
- Over-crediting risk is elevated by the stratification corrective action and by unresolved leakage treatment (0% deduction with inconsistent justification).

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims being made from these credits. Nonetheless, claim safety is constrained by potential over-crediting signals: CAR01 flags stratification inconsistencies (monitoring/verification package), and leakage is treated as 0% with inconsistent justification across monitoring reports. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity label claims.

### Documentation — 7.1 / 10

- + A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 14 documents used.
- Multiple cross-document contradictions (safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing; leakage; reversals) reduce reliability of the narrative.

The extracted record references a substantial set of documents (including PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance) and indicates high extraction confidence with 14 documents used, supporting a solid documentation score. However, several key statements differ between the validation report (2016-08-02) and the later monitoring report (2022-06-01), especially on safeguards-related items, which undermines document consistency. Corrective actions are explicitly listed (CAR01), which is good for audit trail completeness but indicates issues that should be resolved and clearly documented.

## Risk Indicators

|                        |                                                        |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| ● <b>Additionality</b> | VVB-confirmed investment test                          |
| ● <b>Permanence</b>    | 25% buffer; no reversals reported                      |
| ● <b>Leakage</b>       | 0% deduction with weak/inconsistent justification      |
| ● <b>Baseline</b>      | Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear |
| ● <b>Safeguards</b>    | Safeguards/FPIC/grievance claims contradicted          |
| ● <b>Double-claim</b>  | Not CORSIA-eligible                                    |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, methodology-aligned leakage assessment and justification (or quantified deduction) consistent across monitoring reports, including activity-shifting/market leakage screening where applicable.

→ Close CAR01 with documented evidence showing corrected stratification consistent with forest inventory/second-class investigation data, and publish a transparent reconciliation of claimed vs verified ERs for the monitoring period.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- AFOLU Project Element Assessment
- Registration Review Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Non-permanence risk report
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- 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-451C89E1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)