

QUALITY REPORT

Fujian Qingliu IFM (conversion of logged to protected forest) Project

VCS-2606 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-16D7E614 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.0
■ Transparency (25%)	7.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.5
■ Documentation (15%)	6.5

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows reasonable integrity with VVB-confirmed additionality, a sizable 22% buffer pool and a quantified 20% leakage deduction reported in the monitoring report. However, contradictions between documents (reported reversals in issuance vs none in later validation/monitoring, and leakage not addressed in the PDD but quantified in monitoring) and several missing baseline details weaken confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2606
Sector	redd
Country	China
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	VM0010 1.3
Crediting Period	2017 — 2046
VVB	China Environmental United Certification Center Co., Ltd
Verified ERs	357,652 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Contradictory records on reversal events (issuance record reports reversals while later validation/monitoring report states none).
- Leakage was not addressed in the PDD but later reported as quantified with a 20% deduction — indicates data evolution and initial omission.
- Key baseline details (reassessment timing) and emissions factors are not stated in available documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.0 / 10

+ additionality confirmed by the VVB (validation report / monitoring report)

- contradictions on reversal reporting (issuance reports reversals; validation/monitoring report states none) and no baseline reassessment stated

Additionality is supported by an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the validation/monitoring materials, and a 22% buffer pool is assigned (monitoring report / validation report). The project uses a project-specific baseline (VM0010 project method) and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents, which weakens baseline robustness. There is a contradiction on reversal events: the issuance document (2022-05-13) records reversals while the later validation and monitoring report (2022-10-21) state none reported; this reduces confidence in non-permanence handling and has been penalized in the integrity score.

Transparency — 7.0 / 10

+ VVB named and monitoring period provided; verified emission reductions reported (monitoring report 2022-10-21)

~ usage and grid emission factors not stated in available documents, limiting reproducibility

Transparency is relatively good: the VVB is named (China Environmental United Certification Center), the monitoring period and verified ERR are provided (monitoring report 2017-01-01 — 2021-11-30; total verified ERR 357,652), and multiple evidence documents are present. However, several technical details are missing from the extracted record (grid emission factor, usage rates, total ERR claimed), which limits independent reproducibility.

Claim Safety — 5.5 / 10

+ leakage deduction of 20% and quantified justification in the monitoring report (2022-10-21)

- project-specific baseline with no reassessment date and lack of CCP/CORSIA status increases over-crediting/double-claim risk

Leakage is addressed in the monitoring report with a quantified 20% deduction and justification, which reduces over-crediting risk. Nevertheless, the project relies on a project-specific baseline without a stated reassessment date and has no stated CCP/CORSIA status in the available records, increasing residual risk of double-claiming or baseline bias. The earlier PDD did not address leakage (PDD 2022-04-18) while the monitoring report does, indicating initial under-documentation.

Documentation — 6.5 / 10

+ multiple documents available including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance; high extraction confidence

~ contradictions between documents (issuance vs validation/monitoring; PDD vs monitoring on leakage) reduce reliability

Documentation is moderate: there are multiple documents (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and extraction confidence is high; monitoring report is recent (2022-10-21). No material findings or corrective actions were extracted. The presence of contradictory statements between documents (notably on reversals and leakage) and missing baseline reassessment details reduce the documentation score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	buffer present; reversal record mixed
● Leakage	20% deduction reported; earlier PDD omitted leakage
● Baseline	project-specific baseline; reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance described
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish clear reconciliation explaining the issuance-recorded reversals vs later validation/monitoring conclusion and provide supporting evidence.

→ Document baseline reassessment timing and supply missing technical inputs (grid emission factor, usage rates) and a clear statement on CCP/CORSIA eligibility.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Non-permanence risk report
- QINGLIU_VCS_2606.kml
- Draft Project Description
- Listing Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation

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-16D7E614 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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