


QUALITY REPORT

Hubei Hongshan IFM (Conversion Of Logged To Protected Forest) Project

VCS-1935 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-593EC6B3 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

The project shows moderate integrity and good transparency: a recent monitoring report (2023) confirms verified removals equal to claimed removals and a VVB attested additionality. However, multiple contradictions between validation, PDD and the latest monitoring report (notably on additionality, safeguards, FPIC and leakage) reduce confidence and suggest some data reliability issues.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1935
Sector	redd
Country	China
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	VM0010 1.3
Crediting Period	2015 — 2044
VVB	China Testing and Certification International Group Co., Ltd
Verified ERs	1,195,059 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	30 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Contradictory statements across documents about whether additionality was VVB-confirmed
- Contradictions on safeguards, FPIC and grievance mechanism between validation (2019) and monitoring (2023)

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.5 / 10

- + Buffer pool of 22% and no reversal events reported in the monitoring report (monitoring_report, 2023-11-08)
- Multiple contradictions on additionality, safeguards and leakage across validation, PDD and the monitoring report indicating reliability concerns

The monitoring report (2023) shows no reversal events and a 22% buffer pool, and the VVB confirmed additionality in the latest report — positive signs for permanence and additionality. However, additionality is contradicted by an earlier document that did not confirm it, and the project uses a project-specific baseline (VM0010) with no recorded reassessment date, which weakens baseline robustness. A listed corrective action (CAR 01) also indicates some outstanding issues. Taken together these raise moderate concern and lower the integrity score.

Transparency — 7.5 / 10

- + Monitoring period and verified vs claimed removals stated; VVB named as China Testing and Certification International Group (monitoring_report, 2023-11-08)
- ~ Unavailable grid emission factor and some project parameters not stated in extracted records (not found in available documents)

Transparency is relatively strong: the monitoring report provides the monitoring period (2019-07-01 to 2023-09-30), the VVB is named, and total ERs claimed equal total ERs verified (1,195,059). The project registry is VCS and evidence includes PDD, validation report, monitoring report and issuance. Missing items (grid emission factor, some usage-rate fields) are not found in the extracted record, but extraction confidence is high and many documents were used, supporting a good transparency rating.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

- + Not CORSIA-eligible (CORSIA false) and methodology VM0010 stated (monitoring_report, 2023-11-08)
- Leakage treated as negligible with a 0% deduction but documentation shows contradictory treatment and justification (monitoring_report vs other docs)

Claim risk is moderate. The project is not CORSIA-eligible and there is no evidence of CCP approval, which reduces double-claim risk. However, leakage is set to negligible with a 0% deduction in the monitoring report while other documents either do not address leakage or contradict that treatment, creating over-crediting risk. Usage rates and some parameters are not reported, limiting the ability to judge conservative assumptions.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

- + Recent monitoring report (2023-11-08), validation report and PDD are in the evidence set; 28 documents used and high extraction confidence
- Corrective action CAR 01 remains listed and several key items are inconsistent across documents, reducing documentary reliability

Documentation is recent and multiple core documents are present (validation report, PDD, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 28 documents used. Nevertheless, several contradictions across documents (see merged_facts.contradictions) and a corrective action lower the documentation score: the validation report (2019) states no safeguards/FPIC/grievance while the monitoring report (2023) states these were implemented. The presence of CAR 01 also reduces confidence in completeness.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB confirmation in latest report but earlier docs contradic
● Permanence	buffer pool present; no reversals reported
● Leakage	0% leakage deduction stated but justification inconsistent a
● Baseline	project-specific baseline; no reassessment date provided
● Safeguards	safeguards and FPIC claimed in 2023 but validation earlier s
● Double-claim	not CORSIA-eligible and no CCP evidence

What Would Improve This Score

→ Resolve and publish reconciliation between validation (2019) and the 2023 monitoring report on additionality, safeguards, FPIC and grievance mechanism, and close CAR 01 with documented evidence.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- CCB MR Summary Draft
- CCB Monitoring Report Draft
- CCB Monitoring Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Review Report
- CCB-VCS1935_KML.kml
- Registration Representation
- CCB PD Summary Draft
- Non-permanence risk report
- Public Commentary
- Project Description
- CCB Project Description Draft
- Listing Representation
- CCB Project Description
- CCB Verification Statement
- Verification Report
- CCB Verification Report
- CCB Validation Report
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- CCB Validation Statement

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-593EC6B3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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