QUALITY REPORT

4×50 MW Dayingjiang- 3 Hydropower Project Phases 1&2

VCS-191 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-4FFC39F3 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	4.8
Transparency (25%)	4.2
Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a hydropower avoidance project with VVB-verified additionality, but the record has important reliability and safeguard gaps. The project was denied verification approval at registry level, and the documents contain several contradictions on safeguards, leakage treatment, and additionality, which weakens confidence in the claimed reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-191
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2008, 2011
Project Methodology	ACM0002 10
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	Japan Consulting Institute
Verified ERs	3,614,268 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

■ Registry status shows verification approval request denied, which is a major credibility concern.

■ The documents conflict on safeguards, FPIC, benefit sharing, leakage treatment, and additionality, indicating inconsistent project records.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and was later confirmed by the VVB in the validation report.

- The monitoring report required corrections to project capacity, financial analysis, and project dates, and the record contains a contradiction with the PDD on whether additionality was accepted.

The project has some positive integrity signals because the validation report confirms additionality through an investment test, and the monitoring report shows no reversal events for this hydropower avoidance activity. However, the monitoring report also required corrective actions on installed capacity, financial analysis, and project schedule, which suggests material documentation issues. The contradiction between the PDD and validation report on whether additionality was accepted further weakens confidence in the baseline and additionality narrative.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report provides a quantified monitoring period and exact claimed and verified emission reductions, which match at 3,614,268.

- Public-facing clarity is weakened by the registry denial and by missing or inconsistent details on usage monitoring, baseline reassessment, and leakage quantification.

Transparency is moderate at best. The monitoring report clearly states the monitoring period and reports identical claimed and verified reductions of 3,614,268, which is helpful. But key MRV details such as usage monitoring method, baseline reassessment timing, and leakage quantification are not stated in available documents, and the registry status being denied reduces public confidence in the record.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

+ The project is an avoidance project with no reversal events reported, so permanence risk is structurally lower than for removals.

- Leakage is only described as negligible in the monitoring report, while the validation report reportedly quantified it, and the project is not CORSIA-eligible.

Claim safety is limited by the project's documentation quality and registry outcome. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market concern, but the leakage treatment is inconsistent because the monitoring report says leakage was deemed negligible while the validation report is described as having quantified leakage. Because the project is a hydropower avoidance project, permanence risk is lower, but the unresolved documentation issues still raise over-crediting concerns.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material.

- The monitoring report lists several corrective actions and the extraction record shows contradictions across documents, reducing documentation reliability.

Documentation breadth is decent because the extracted record includes the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance-related material, and extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report lists three corrective actions, and several safeguard-related items are contradicted across documents. The absence of a clear baseline reassessment and the inconsistent treatment of FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and benefit sharing reduce the overall documentation score.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed but disputed
Permanence	Avoidance project, no reversals reported
Leakage	Negligible claim, inconsistent support
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	No safeguards documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled document set that resolves the contradictions on additionality, leakage, FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and benefit sharing.

→ Publish a clear MRV annex with baseline reassessment, leakage calculation, and usage monitoring details, along with the registry decision rationale.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-4FFC39F3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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