

QUALITY REPORT

65MW Dagushan Hydropower Project In China

VCS-653 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-41BD6B9F · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project has VVB-confirmed additionality and a complete-looking document set, but several internal inconsistencies across reports raise reliability and over-crediting concerns. Leakage treatment is unclear in the more recent monitoring record, and key parameters (grid emission factor and even the crediting period) conflict across documents.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-653
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	TUV SUD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Verified ERs	122,100 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	36 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Conflicting verified/claimed emission reductions across validation reports (122,100 vs 137,144), indicating data reliability issues.
- Grid emission factor differs materially between monitoring reports (0.5536 vs 0.8712), which can significantly change credited reductions.
- Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2019–2029 vs 2009–2019), creating uncertainty about eligibility and period boundaries.
- Corrective action notes inconsistencies between the monitoring report narrative and the ER calculation spreadsheet.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation in the extracted record).

- Baseline and key quantification inputs show inconsistencies across monitoring/validation documents (e.g., grid emission factor and ERR figures), weakening confidence in the baseline and ER calculation.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation documentation indicates an investment test and confirms additionality by the VVB. However, baseline robustness is weakened by conflicting grid emission factors between monitoring reports (2022 monitoring report: 0.5536 vs 2021 monitoring report: 0.8712), which can materially change calculated reductions under ACM0002. Leakage is not treated consistently: the 2022 monitoring report does not address leakage, while an older validation report (2011) deems it negligible; this inconsistency reduces confidence in completeness of the integrity assessment.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ VVB is identified (TUV SUD South Asia Pvt Ltd) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2021-01-01 to 2021-12-31) in the monitoring report (2022).

- A corrective action in the monitoring report (2022) flags inconsistencies between the monitoring report and the ER spreadsheet, reducing MRV clarity.

The monitoring period is clearly specified (2021-01-01—2021-12-31) in the monitoring report dated 2022-08-15, and the VVB is named (TUV SUD South Asia Pvt Ltd). Reported claimed and verified ERs match within the selected record (both 122,100), but contradictions across validation reports (122,100 vs 137,144) reduce transparency on what was ultimately asserted and checked. The monitoring report (2022) includes a corrective action noting inconsistencies between the monitoring report text and the ER calculation spreadsheet, which undermines MRV clarity.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing some downstream claim and double-claiming risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by conflicting ERR totals and a materially different grid emission factor across monitoring reports.

CORSIA eligibility is explicitly stated as false, which lowers the risk of certain high-profile compliance claims. Nonetheless, over-crediting/greenwashing risk is elevated because key quantification inputs and outcomes vary across documents: the grid emission factor differs substantially across monitoring reports (0.5536 vs 0.8712), and total ERs differ across validation reports (122,100 vs 137,144). With leakage not addressed in the most recent monitoring record, buyers have less assurance that all relevant sources of overstatement were considered.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

- + Multiple core document types are present in the extracted record (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 26 documents used.
- Several cross-document contradictions (safeguards, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, FPIC, crediting period) indicate documentation inconsistency despite breadth.

The extracted record indicates a relatively complete documentation set (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and a high extraction confidence with 26 documents used. However, the presence of multiple contradictions across monitoring/validation documents (safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, crediting period, grid emission factor, and ERR totals) suggests version control or reporting quality issues. The monitoring report (2022) also lists a corrective action related to inconsistent ER reporting between the narrative and spreadsheet, further indicating documentation quality concerns despite breadth.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent/unclear
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent over time
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish a clear version-controlled reconciliation note explaining the correct crediting period, grid emission factor selection, and why earlier documents show different values.
- Resolve the corrective action by aligning the monitoring report narrative with the ER calculation spreadsheet and providing an auditable ER breakdown for the full crediting period and all schemes.
- Provide an explicit leakage assessment consistent with ACM0002 requirements (even if negligible) in the latest monitoring/verification package, with justification and any deduction stated.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Verification 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-41BD6B9F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy