

QUALITY REPORT

Tadi 16 MW Hydropower Project In Zhejiang Province

VCS-792 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-C6164F1E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
■ Transparency (25%)	6.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
■ Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project has VVB-confirmed additionality and a clean verification outcome for the monitored period, with claimed and verified reductions matching. However, key integrity elements are weakly evidenced in the extracted record, especially leakage treatment and baseline reassessment timing, and there are notable cross-document inconsistencies on safeguards/FPIC and the crediting period.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-792
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 07
Crediting Period	2008 — 2009
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Verified ERs	97,521 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2008 — 2009
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report and no leakage deduction is stated, creating an evidence gap for a core accounting element.
- Contradictions across documents on FPIC/safeguards and on the crediting period reduce confidence in the reliability of the project narrative and boundaries.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring report shows additionality confirmed by the VVB using an investment test and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the monitoring report, and baseline reassessment timing is not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2010-08-03) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test and reports no material findings and no corrective actions. Baseline setting is project-specific (ACM0002 v07), and the grid emission factor is reported as 0.9046, but the grid EF vintage year and any baseline reassessment date are not found in the extracted record. Leakage is explicitly not addressed in the monitoring report and no leakage deduction is stated, which weakens accounting robustness.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ Claimed and verified emission reductions match (97,521 tCO₂e) for the stated monitoring period in the monitoring report.

- Key MRV/context fields are missing in the extracted record (for example, the grid EF vintage year and any baseline reassessment date).

For the monitoring period 2008-01-01 to 2009-11-22, the monitoring report (2010-08-03) reports 97,521 tCO₂e claimed and 97,521 tCO₂e verified, suggesting a consistent verification outcome. The VVB is identified as Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS, supporting audit traceability. However, several contextual MRV details are missing in the extracted record (for example, the grid EF year and leakage quantification), limiting reproducibility from the extracted data alone.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream double-claiming/eligibility risks.

- Over-crediting risk is harder to rule out because leakage is not addressed and the baseline is project-specific with no reassessment timing found.

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of certain aviation-related claims. Still, the baseline is project-specific and the extracted record does not show when it was last reassessed, increasing uncertainty around baseline conservativeness over time. In addition, leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, which increases residual over-crediting/claim risk because a potential deduction is neither justified nor quantified.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is high.

- Document set contains material inconsistencies (FPIC/safeguards and crediting period), which undermines document reliability.

The extracted record includes a monitoring report, validation report, and PDD, with high extraction confidence and a relatively large number of documents used (8). The monitoring report (2010-08-03) shows no corrective actions required, which supports completeness for that period. Nevertheless, contradictions across documents on safeguards/FPIC and the crediting period indicate documentation inconsistency that reduces confidence in the overall record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed; deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance not evidenced; safeguards inconsistent
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment and, if applicable, a quantified leakage deduction with justification in monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Resolve and document consistent statements on FPIC/safeguards and clarify the definitive crediting period with registry-aligned evidence (e.g., VCS registration/issuance records).

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Validation 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-C6164F1E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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