QUALITY REPORT

Zhangbei Mijiagou 49.5 MW Windfarm Project

CDM-2aedac · CDM Standard · China

Report ID: CM-1CB9565C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	**5.2**
	Transparency (25%)	**5.6**
	Claim Safety (25%)	**6.4**
	Documentation (15%)	**6.8**

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

Assessment Summary

This is a CDM grid-connected wind project using ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no reported material findings. However, key elements that affect credit quality—especially leakage treatment and social safeguards—are inconsistently described across documents, and several baseline-related details (such as reassessment timing) are not evidenced in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	CDM Standard
Registry ID	CDM-2aedac
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2010
Project Methodology	ACM0002 15
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	406,306 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2015 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (monitoring report says leakage not addressed, while the validation report deems it negligible).
- ■ Safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are claimed in the PDD but appear absent in the monitoring report, raising implementation/verification concerns.
- ■ Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the validation report.

- Leakage is not consistently treated (monitoring report does not address leakage; validation report deems it negligible), and no leakage deduction is evidenced.

The project applies ACM0002 (version 15) and uses a project-specific baseline approach, with a grid emission factor reported as 0.917. The validation report confirms additionality via the VVB, and no material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record. Integrity is weakened by leakage: the monitoring report indicates leakage was not addressed, while the validation report characterizes leakage as negligible, and no explicit leakage deduction is evidenced.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ A quantified verified ER figure is available (406,306 tCO2e) for the stated monitoring period.

- Claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record, and several MRV-relevant fields (e.g., leakage deduction, baseline reassessment timing) are missing or inconsistent.

The monitoring period is clearly stated (2015-10-01 to 2019-12-31) and the extracted record includes a verified ER total of 406,306 tCO2e. However, the claimed ER total is not found in the extracted record, limiting cross-checking of issuance claims versus verification. Transparency is also reduced by missing or inconsistent disclosure on leakage treatment and by the absence of a stated baseline reassessment date.

Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ Not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim and double-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk is harder to rule out because leakage handling is contradictory and baseline is project-specific with reassessment timing not evidenced.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of higher-stakes aviation-related claims and some double-claim concerns. Nonetheless, claim safety is constrained by uncertainty around over-crediting controls: leakage handling is contradictory between the monitoring report and validation report, and the baseline is project-specific with no baseline reassessment timing evidenced in the extracted record. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving an additional quality/eligibility signal unresolved.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence and no corrective actions reported.

- Multiple cross-document contradictions on safeguards and leakage reduce reliability of the documentary record.

Three key document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting a moderate-to-good documentation score. The validation report shows no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is a positive signal for completeness. However, repeated contradictions between the PDD and monitoring report on safeguards-related items (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, safeguards mention) and between monitoring and validation on leakage reduce confidence that the documentation consistently reflects implementation.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversal risk evidenced
● **Leakage**	Leakage inconsistent / not evidenced
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment not evidenced
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards not evidenced in monitoring
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, consistent leakage assessment aligned with ACM0002, including an explicit statement of whether leakage is applicable and any quantified deduction (or a documented justification for 0%).

→ Provide monitoring/verification evidence for safeguards implementation (FPIC records, grievance mechanism operation, stakeholder consultation outcomes, and any benefit-sharing arrangements) and reconcile discrepancies between the PDD and monitoring report.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification Report

Report ID: CM-1CB9565C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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