

QUALITY REPORT

Yiyang Xiushan Hydropower Project, P.R. China

VCS-699 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-487F9B0E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
■ Transparency (25%)	6.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
■ Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality (investment test) and uses a standard grid-connected renewable methodology (ACM0002), which supports basic credibility. However, key elements show internal inconsistencies across documents—especially around leakage treatment, safeguards, and the verified ER volume—raising over-crediting and reliability concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-699
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 06
Crediting Period	2007 — 2017
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	1,076,341 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large discrepancy in verified ERs between validation reports (1,076,341 vs 353,256), creating over-crediting and data reliability risk
- Leakage is inconsistently treated across monitoring reports (described as “quantified” in 2010 but “not addressed” in 2022) while applying a 0% leakage deduction

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents; leakage treatment is inconsistent while using a 0% deduction.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation/verification record confirms an investment test and VVB confirmation. The baseline approach is project-specific (per the monitoring/validation documentation using ACM0002), and the extracted record does not state when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens robustness over a long crediting period. Leakage is applied as a 0% deduction, but the monitoring record is inconsistent on whether leakage was quantified or not addressed, which undermines confidence in the leakage conclusion.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

- + Key MRV elements are present (methodology ACM0002 v06, grid emission factor stated, monitoring period stated) and no material findings/corrective actions are reported.
- Contradictory ER totals and conflicting statements on leakage/safeguards reduce confidence in the consistency of public reporting.

The extracted record provides core MRV parameters such as the monitoring period (2012-09-23 to 2017-09-30), the grid emission factor (0.9436) and its reference year (2006), and identifies the VVB (Applus+). No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted verification/monitoring record, which is a positive signal. However, transparency is weakened by major inconsistencies across official documents on ER totals and on whether leakage and safeguards were addressed.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain double-claiming/eligibility-related marketing risks.
- ER volume contradictions and inconsistent leakage narrative increase perceived over-crediting/greenwashing risk; CCP status is not stated in available documents.

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces risks of certain aviation-claims misuse. At the same time, the contradiction in verified ER totals between validation reports (2010 vs 2022) materially increases over-crediting risk perception because it is unclear which figure is authoritative. Leakage is also inconsistently described across monitoring reports while remaining at a 0% deduction, which can be problematic for conservative claims. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity claims.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

- + A relatively complete document set is indicated (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 13 documents used and high extraction confidence.
- Multiple cross-document contradictions (crediting period, safeguards, leakage, ER totals) indicate documentation quality/control issues despite document availability.

Documentation coverage appears relatively strong: the evidence list includes a PDD, monitoring report(s), validation report(s), and issuance records, with 13 documents used and high extraction confidence. The most recent extracted monitoring/validation documents are dated 2022-08-08/2022-08-09, which supports recency. Nonetheless, repeated contradictions across documents (safeguards, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, FPIC, leakage treatment, crediting period, and ER totals) indicate weak document control and reduce confidence in the record as a whole.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● Leakage	0% deduction with inconsistent justification
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent across documents
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear reconciliation note (from the VVB or registry/issuance documentation) explaining why the verified ER total differs so substantially between the 2010 and 2022 validation reports, including which periods and calculations each figure covers.

→ Publish consistent, auditable leakage and safeguards sections across monitoring reports (including explicit leakage assessment under ACM0002 and documented FPIC/grievance evidence) to remove contradictions and support conservative claims.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation 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-487F9B0E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy