

QUALITY REPORT

Project 9510 : Fiji Nadarivatu Hydropower Project

VCS-9510 · Fujian pilot ETS

Report ID: CM-D31815D2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.3
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected renewable electricity project validated under ACM0002 with additionality confirmed via an investment test. However, key quantification and MRV elements (monitoring period, grid emission factor details, and verified ERs) are not present in the extracted record, and leakage treatment is inconsistent between the PDD and validation report. Overall, the project appears plausible but is hard to independently assess for over-crediting risk based on the available extracted documents.

Project Details

Registry ID	VCS-9510
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Fujian pilot ETS
Vintage	2022
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.1.0
Crediting Period	2013-04-01 — not_stated
VVB	Japan Consulting Institute
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Monitoring period and verified emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency and over-crediting checks
- Leakage is treated inconsistently across documents (PDD does not address leakage; validation report deems it negligible)

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation report (2012-12-24) confirms additionality using an investment test and reports no material findings or corrective actions

- Baseline and key parameters for quantification (grid emission factor year/value and reassessment timing) are not found in the extracted record

The validation report (2012-12-24) confirms additionality via an investment test and reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports basic integrity. The baseline approach is project-specific and key baseline quantification inputs (grid emission factor value/year and when the baseline was last reassessed) are not found in the extracted record, weakening confidence in baseline validity. Leakage is not consistently treated across documents, which introduces uncertainty about whether all relevant sources were considered.

Transparency — 4.3 / 10

+ A named VVB (Japan Consulting Institute) and core validation documentation (PDD and validation report) are available

- Monitoring period and claimed/verified ER totals are not found in the extracted record, preventing reconciliation of results

Transparency is limited because the extracted record does not include a monitoring period or any claimed versus verified emission reduction totals, so results cannot be independently reconciled. On the positive side, the VVB is identified as Japan Consulting Institute and both the PDD and validation report are available. Still, the absence of core MRV outputs in the extracted record materially reduces transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project uses an established grid-connected renewable methodology (ACM0002 v12.1.0), which can support standardized accounting when fully disclosed

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because grid emission factor details and ER totals are not found in the extracted record, and leakage handling is inconsistent

Claim safety is constrained by missing quantification details: the grid emission factor and ER totals are not found in the extracted record, making it difficult to assess over-crediting risk for an avoidance renewable project. The methodology (ACM0002 v12.1.0) is a recognized approach, but without disclosed parameter values and verification outcomes, marketing claims should be conservative. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, adding uncertainty for downstream claims and labels.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Extraction confidence is high and the validation report is dated (2012-12-24) with no corrective actions required

- Only two documents were available (PDD and validation report), and multiple key fields (monitoring period, ER totals, grid EF) are missing from the extracted record

Documentation is moderate: the extracted record draws on two official documents (PDD and validation report) with high extraction confidence. The validation report is dated 2012-12-24 and indicates no corrective actions required, which supports completeness for the validation stage. However, key operational/monitoring documentation elements (monitoring period and ER totals) are not present in the extracted record, suggesting an incomplete document set for performance assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● Leakage	Negligible claim but inconsistent across documents
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; key EF details not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned but key elements not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring report/verification report with the monitoring period, claimed and verified ER totals, and any findings to enable MRV reconciliation

→ Disclose baseline parameter details (grid emission factor value, year, and any reassessment) and explicitly align leakage treatment between the PDD and validation report

Documents Reviewed

- Support Document 1
- Support Document 2
- Support Document 3

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-D31815D2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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