QUALITY REPORT

Wutuhe Erji Hydro Power Project In Guizhou Province, China

VCS-330 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-F118CD7C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	4.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.3
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.1

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydro project has VVB-confirmed additionality and a clear monitoring period with verified issuance quantities, but key baseline and leakage details are not consistently documented in the extracted record. Corrective actions in the monitoring/verification cycle and an internal contradiction on leakage treatment increase over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-330
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D. 13
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	China Classification Society Certification Company
Verified ERs	33,037 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2010 says negligible; 2014 says not addressed), undermining confidence in completeness of GHG boundary treatment.
- ■ Corrective actions required include a mismatch between exported electricity data and the calculation spreadsheet, which directly affects ER quantification.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation in the extracted record).

- Baseline approach and reassessment timing were not stated in the extracted record, and leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports.

The extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation). However, the baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, and there is no stated timing for baseline reassessment, which weakens confidence in baseline validity over the long crediting period (2006-03-28 to 2016-03-27). Leakage is also not robustly treated: the 2014 monitoring report indicates leakage was not addressed, which is a material completeness concern for integrity.

Transparency — 6.3 / 10

+ Both claimed and verified ERs are available (34,696 claimed vs 33,037 verified) for the stated monitoring period (2012-06-26 to 2013-11-25).

- Key MRV elements (e.g., baseline method details, leakage deduction) are missing or inconsistent in the extracted record, and corrective actions indicate reporting/calculation issues.

The monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-06-26 to 2013-11-25), and both claimed and verified ER totals are provided (34,696 vs 33,037), which supports traceability. The monitoring report dated 2014-01-02 lists corrective actions, including updating the template version and correcting inconsistencies between Balance Advice Note electricity export data and the calculation spreadsheet, which reduces confidence in MRV quality. Several key fields (e.g., baseline method, leakage deduction percentage) were not found in the extracted record, limiting transparency.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ Not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by the electricity export data inconsistency flagged for correction and unclear/contradictory leakage handling.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of problematic aviation-related claims. Still, the corrective action about inconsistent exported electricity data (monitoring report, 2014) is directly linked to ER calculation and increases over-crediting/quantification risk until clearly resolved. The lack of a clear, consistent leakage position (negligible vs not addressed) further increases greenwashing risk because stakeholders cannot easily verify boundary completeness.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

+ Multiple document types are present (monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Corrective actions required (template version update and data inconsistency) indicate documentation/QA weaknesses in the monitoring package.

The evidence set includes monitoring, validation, and issuance documentation, and extraction confidence is high, supporting a relatively strong documentation score. However, the monitoring report (2014-01-02) includes corrective actions requiring both a template update and correction of electricity export data inconsistencies, indicating weaknesses in document quality control. Safeguards elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are not evidenced in the extracted record, which also reduces completeness from a documentation perspective.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● **Leakage**	Leakage inconsistent / not clearly treated
● **Baseline**	Baseline method not evidenced in extracted record
● **Safeguards**	No FPIC/grievance evidence found
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the baseline method description and any baseline/grid EF reassessment evidence for the monitoring period, including references to the applicable methodology and parameter sources.

→ Resolve and document leakage treatment consistently (explicit justification and any deduction, even if 0%), and publish the corrected electricity export dataset/spreadsheet referenced in the corrective actions.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-F118CD7C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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