QUALITY REPORT

# Shiyazi Hydro Power Project In Guizhou Province China

VCS-936 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-0D7A07F5 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**6.3**
Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|---|---|
| Integrity (35%) | 6.1 |
| Transparency (25%) | 6.4 |
| Claim Safety (25%) | 6.0 |
| Documentation (15%) | 6.8 |

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

## Assessment Summary

This VCS hydropower project uses an established grid-connected renewable methodology and has additionality confirmed by the VVB, with no material findings or corrective actions reported. However, key integrity elements are weakened by missing or inconsistent treatment of leakage and by contradictions across documents on safeguards and the crediting period.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Registry | Verra (VCS) |
| Registry ID | VCS-936 |
| Sector | renewable_energy |
| Country | China |
| Vintage | Stale |
| Project Methodology | ACM0002 12.1.0 |
| Crediting Period | 2011 — 2011 |
| VVB | TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd. |
| Verified ERs | 116,782 tCO2e |
| Monitoring Period | 2011 — 2011 |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 10 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-02 |

## Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is inconsistently handled: the monitoring report does not address leakage, while the PDD deems it negligible, and no leakage deduction is reported.
- ■ Crediting period is contradictory between the monitoring report (a short 2011 period) and the PDD (2011–2018), raising reliability/over-crediting concerns.
- ■ Safeguards disclosure is inconsistent between the PDD and the validation report, and FPIC/grievance mechanism are not evidenced in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.1 / 10

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

- Leakage treatment is weak and inconsistent across documents, with no quantified deduction reported.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the VVB (TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd.) confirmed additionality using an investment test, as reflected in the validation/verification record. Baseline setting is project-specific under ACM0002, but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens robustness. Leakage is a key weakness: the monitoring report (2012) does not address leakage and no leakage deduction is reported, undermining completeness for an avoidance crediting claim.

### Transparency — 6.4 / 10

+ A specific monitoring period is provided and verified ERs are reported (116,782 $tCO_2e$) in the monitoring report (2012).

- Key baseline governance details (e.g., when the baseline was last reassessed) are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage reporting is incomplete.

The monitoring report (2012-11-12) clearly states the monitored period (2011-04-28 to 2011-09-04) and reports verified emission reductions of 116,782 $tCO_2e$, which supports MRV traceability. However, the extracted record lacks the claimed ER figure and does not provide supporting detail on leakage accounting, limiting third-party reproducibility. Registry and VVB identity are clear (VCS; TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd.), but some key parameters (e.g., grid EF vintage year) are not stated in the extracted record.

### Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

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

- Contradictions on crediting period and leakage handling increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of certain compliance-market double-claiming narratives. Nonetheless, over-crediting risk is elevated by inconsistent documentation on the crediting period and by incomplete leakage treatment (monitoring report does not address leakage; no deduction reported). CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity claims that rely on CCP-alignment.

### Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Multiple core document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence and no corrective actions listed.

- Internal inconsistencies across documents (leakage, safeguards, crediting period) reduce confidence in the record’s coherence.

Core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and the extraction confidence is high, which supports usability of the record. The monitoring report indicates no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is a positive signal for audit outcomes. However, contradictions between documents on safeguards, leakage justification, and the crediting period reduce documentation coherence and should be resolved for stronger confidence.

## Risk Indicators

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

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, consistent leakage assessment for the monitored period (including whether leakage is negligible and the basis), and disclose any applied leakage deduction.

→ Resolve and publicly clarify the crediting period discrepancy between the PDD and monitoring report, and align registry documentation to the issuance period(s).

→ Publish/attach safeguards evidence (e.g., stakeholder consultation records, FPIC where relevant, and a grievance mechanism) and ensure consistency between the PDD and validation report.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report



Report ID: CM-0D7A07F5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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