QUALITY REPORT

NANSHA HYDRO POWER PROJECT IN YUNNAN PROVINCE CHINA

VCS-884 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-D432B04E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.2
Transparency (25%)	6.1
Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected hydro project under ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB, but several internal inconsistencies across documents reduce confidence in key parameters and reported outcomes. Leakage treatment and crediting-period details are unclear/inconsistent, and the monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions related to missing parameters and meter calibration evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-884
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017
Project Methodology	ACM0002 06
Crediting Period	2007 — 2028
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	2,745,232 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Large discrepancy in verified emission reductions between validation reports (2,745,232 vs 478,420), raising over-crediting and data reliability concerns

■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (quantified in the validation report but not addressed in the monitoring report), with no clear leakage deduction reported

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB.

- Leakage is not consistently treated (monitoring report does not address leakage; leakage deduction not evidenced), and the monitoring report lists corrective actions for missing monitoring parameters and meter calibration records.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation/verification record confirms an investment test and VVB confirmation. However, baseline setting is project-specific under ACM0002 and there is no clear evidence in the extracted record of when the baseline was last reassessed. Leakage is a key weakness: the monitoring report (2022) does not address leakage and no leakage deduction is evidenced, and the monitoring report lists corrective actions on missing monitoring parameters and meter calibration records, which undermines confidence in quantified ERs.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are identifiable (methodology ACM0002, grid emission factor stated, monitoring period stated, VVB named).

- Contradictory figures for verified ERs and multiple document inconsistencies reduce confidence in the public record and MRV clarity.

The monitoring period (2012-09-01 to 2017-12-27), methodology (ACM0002 v06), grid emission factor (0.84335; year 2007), and VVB (Applus+) are clearly identified in the extracted record. No material findings are reported, but the monitoring report (2022) still requests clarifications and missing evidence, which reduces MRV transparency. A major transparency issue is the contradictory ER total reported across validation documents, which makes it difficult for third parties to reconcile what was actually verified/issued.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory ER totals and unclear leakage treatment; crediting-period inconsistency further complicates claims.

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of aviation-related double-claim pathways, though CCP status is not stated in the extracted record. Claim safety is weakened by the inconsistency in verified ER totals between validation reports and by unclear leakage treatment (quantified vs not addressed), both of which increase perceived over-crediting/greenwashing risk. The crediting-period inconsistency also creates ambiguity about which vintages and volumes are legitimately claimable under VCS.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 13 documents used.

- The monitoring report includes several corrective actions (missing parameter reporting, unsubstantiated dates, and unclear calibration records), indicating documentation gaps in implementation evidence.

The extracted record references multiple core documents (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and indicates high extraction confidence with 13 documents used, supporting a mid-to-strong documentation score. Nevertheless, the monitoring report (2022) lists corrective actions requiring missing parameter reporting, substantiation of implementation dates, and clarification/calibration records for backup meters. These items indicate that some underlying evidence was incomplete or not presented clearly at the time of assessment.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation table linking monitoring-period ER calculations to issuance records, resolving the conflicting ER totals across validation documents.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment and (if applicable) a quantified leakage deduction consistent across the monitoring and validation/verification documentation, plus complete meter calibration records and missing parameter tables requested in the monitoring report.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- 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-D432B04E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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