QUALITY REPORT

Datong River Zhuchaxia Hydropower Station

VCS-817 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-E5F6DD50 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	6.1
Transparency (25%)	6.4
Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project shows some core integrity strengths (VVB-confirmed investment additionality and no reported findings), but it has notable internal inconsistencies across documents on credited volumes and even the crediting period. Leakage treatment is weakly supported (0% deduction with leakage not addressed in the latest monitoring record), increasing over-crediting risk for an ACM0002 grid-displacement project.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-817
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2016
Project Methodology	ACM0002 07
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	China Classification Society Certification Company
Verified ERs	293,331 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2015 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Conflicting credited emission reductions across documents (293,331 vs 180,792), undermining confidence in MRV consistency.

■ Leakage is taken as 0% while the latest monitoring record does not address leakage, weakening the basis for a zero deduction.

■ Safeguards/FPIC and grievance mechanism are inconsistently reported between early validation and later monitoring documents.

■ Crediting period dates conflict between documents, raising registry/administrative reliability concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 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 the extracted record.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB via an investment test (validation report, 2021-06-30; additionality type also noted in the extracted record). The baseline approach is project-specific under ACM0002, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline continued validity. Leakage is treated as a 0% deduction, but the latest monitoring report (2021-08-14) does not address leakage, which is a substantive integrity weakness for a grid-displacement project. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, supporting moderate integrity despite the gaps.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated (2015-12-30 to 2018-03-23) and the claimed and verified totals match in the latest record (293,331).

- Multiple cross-document inconsistencies (ERR totals, crediting period, safeguards) reduce transparency and traceability.

Key MRV elements are present, including a named VVB (China Classification Society Certification Company) and a clearly stated monitoring period (2015-12-30 to 2018-03-23) in the monitoring report (2021-08-14). In the latest record, total claimed and verified emission reductions are the same (293,331), which is a positive transparency signal. However, multiple contradictions across documents (including different ERR totals and different crediting period dates) reduce confidence that the public record is internally consistent and easy to audit end-to-end.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ Claimed and verified emission reductions match in the latest monitoring record, and no material findings/corrective actions are reported.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage justification is weak (0% with leakage not addressed in the latest monitoring report).

Over-crediting risk is elevated by weak leakage substantiation: the monitoring report (2021-08-14) shows a 0% leakage deduction while also not addressing leakage, and an earlier monitoring report (2012-04-12) instead deems leakage negligible. The project uses a project-specific baseline under ACM0002 and the baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record, which adds uncertainty around baseline conservativeness over time. CCP status and CORSIA eligibility are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence for high-integrity claims in markets that screen for these labels.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with 12 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Contradictions between older validation/monitoring documents and later documents indicate recordkeeping and version-control weaknesses.

The extracted record references a reasonably complete set of evidence types (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and indicates 12 documents were used with high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation score. No corrective actions are reported, which suggests the documentation set did not flag unresolved issues. Nonetheless, the presence of several contradictions between older and newer documents indicates documentation/version-control weaknesses that should be resolved for stronger auditability.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● **Leakage**	0% deduction with weak/contradictory justification
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC and grievance inconsistently documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation table linking each monitoring period to issuance quantities and explaining why older documents show 180,792 while later documents show 293,331.

→ Provide an explicit leakage assessment consistent with ACM0002 requirements (or a documented justification for negligible leakage) and ensure it is consistently stated across monitoring reports.

→ Clarify the official crediting period and align it across registry, validation, and monitoring documentation (including any renewals/updates).

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report
- 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-E5F6DD50 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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