

QUALITY REPORT

# Jiangxi Province Le'An County Forest Farm Carbon Sink Project

VCS-1162 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-0CC181C1 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>3.3</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>3.2</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.8</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>1.3</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>4.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a buffer pool, and no reported reversal events in the later record. However, the file contains material contradictions across documents, the registry status is rejected by the administrator, and key MRV fields are missing or not stated, which weakens confidence in the claimed credits.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1162
Sector	redd
Country	China
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	VM0010 1.2
Crediting Period	2006 — 2035
VVB	Natural Climate Solutions
Verified ERs	616,168 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

## Red Flags

- Registry status: REJECTED BY ADMINISTRATOR — project formally rejected (terminal)
- The authoritative registry status is rejected by the administrator, which is a major credibility concern.
- There are contradictions on additionality, safeguards, leakage treatment, reversal treatment, and verified ER totals across documents.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 3.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the later verification record.

- The project-specific baseline method and a 23% buffer pool help, but the record also shows contradictions on leakage, safeguards, and verified ER totals.

The later verification record supports additionality through an investment test and says the VVB confirmed it, which is a meaningful positive. The project also has a 23% buffer pool and reports no reversal events, but the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly reassessed, and the file contains contradictions on additionality, leakage, and reversal treatment. Because the authoritative registry status is rejected by the administrator, integrity confidence is reduced further.

### Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period, VVB name, methodology, and verified emission reduction figure are stated in the extracted record.

- Total claimed ERs, usage monitoring method, and several key MRV details are not found in the available documents.

The extracted record identifies the VVB, methodology, monitoring period, and a verified emissions reduction total, which helps transparency. But the claimed ER total is not found, usage monitoring is not stated, and several other MRV details are missing from the available documents. The medium extraction confidence is acceptable, but the documentation is still incomplete for a high transparency score.

### Claim Safety — 1.3 / 10

+ Leakage is treated quantitatively in the later record, and the project is not CORSIA-eligible.

- The project is rejected by the administrator, and the large discrepancy in verified ER totals across documents raises over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the rejected registry status and by the large mismatch in verified ER totals across documents, with the later record showing 616,168 versus an earlier 90,546. Leakage is treated as quantified in the later record, which is better than an unaddressed zero deduction, but the contradiction with an earlier 0.7% leakage figure still creates uncertainty. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-market concern, but the overall over-crediting risk remains material.

### Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ Nineteen documents were used, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- The evidence set is incomplete on several core items, and the record includes unresolved contradictions between earlier and later documents.

Nineteen documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium, so the record is not thin. Even so, several important fields are missing or not stated, including claimed ERs, usage monitoring, and baseline reassessment timing. The contradictions across documents also indicate that the documentation set is not fully coherent, which limits the score.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed but contradicted
● <b>Permanence</b>	Buffer pool present, no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified but contradicted
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Mentioned but weakly documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible and no CCP approval

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled document trail explaining the contradictions in additionality, leakage, safeguards, reversal status, and verified ER totals.

→ Publish complete MRV evidence, including claimed ERs, usage monitoring details, and a clear baseline reassessment history.

## Documents Reviewed

- PP\_ISS\_REP\_1162\_01JAN2006\_31DEC2009.pdf
- PP\_ISS\_REP\_1162\_01JAN2010\_31DEC2016.pdf
- MONIT\_REP\_1162\_01JAN2010\_31DEC2016.pdf
- MONIT\_REP\_1162\_01JAN2006\_31DEC2009.pdf
- 2013\_Le'an\_carbon\_sink\_MR.pdf
- VERIF\_REP\_1162\_01JAN2006\_31DEC2009.pdf
- VCS\_V\_REQUEST\_DENIED\_1162\_11APR2024.pdf
- PP\_REG\_REP\_1162\_14MAY2013.pdf
- AFOLU\_PROJ\_ELEM\_1162\_01JAN2010\_31DEC2016.pdf
- VCS\_EXTENSION\_NOTICE.pdf
- VCS\_Verification\_Report\_Jiangxi\_Le'an\_Forest.pdf
- PROJ\_DESC\_1162\_10APR2014.pdf
- VERIF\_REP\_1162\_01JAN2010\_31DEC2016.pdf
- VALID\_REP\_1162\_24OCT2013.pdf
- VCS\_Verification\_Representation\_Le'an\_forestry.pdf
- VALID\_REP\_1162\_21APR2014.pdf
- VERIF\_STA\_1162\_01\_JAN2010\_31DEC2016.pdf
- VALID\_STA\_1162\_21APR2014.pdf
- VERIF\_STA\_1162\_01JAN2006\_31DEC2009.pdf

**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-0CC181C1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)