QUALITY REPORT

Cgn Inner Mongolia Zhurihe Phase I Wind Farm Project

VCS-1182 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-03DB694E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.6
Transparency (25%)	6.2
Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
Documentation (15%)	7.1

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS wind project has VVB-confirmed additionality (investment test) and uses the standard ACM0002 methodology, which supports baseline credibility. However, leakage is not addressed in the extracted record and there are major inconsistencies across documents on credited emissions and even the crediting period, which increases over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1182
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	China Testing & Certification International Group Co., Ltd.
Verified ERs	256,089 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	28 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Large discrepancy in reported verified emission reductions across documents (256,089 vs 80,706), raising data reliability and over-crediting concerns
- ■ Leakage treatment is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record
- ■ Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2019–2029 vs 2009–2019), creating uncertainty about eligibility and accounting boundaries

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation report).

- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record (monitoring report).

The validation documentation indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (validation report). The baseline is project-specific under ACM0002, but the extracted record does not show when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens robustness over time (monitoring report, 2022). Leakage is explicitly not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, which is a material gap even for grid-connected wind where leakage is often argued negligible but should be justified (monitoring report, 2022).

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are present (method ACM0002 v20.0, monitoring period 2019-03-04—2021-12-31, grid emission factor 1.0548) in the monitoring report (2022).

- Conflicting emissions figures across validation documents reduce confidence in reported outcomes (validation reports 2013 vs 2022).

The monitoring report (2022-09-01) provides a clear monitoring period (2019-03-04—2021-12-31) and a stated grid emission factor (1.0548), supporting traceability of calculations. However, the extracted record shows a major inconsistency in reported verified emission reductions between validation documents (2013 vs 2022), which undermines transparency and comparability of results. No usage monitoring method is applicable/needed for this grid electricity project, but the absence of a stated grid EF year reduces reproducibility (monitoring report, 2022).

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing some double-claiming channel risk (registry record).

- Contradictory credited/verified ER figures (256,089 vs 80,706) elevate over-crediting and marketing-claim risk (validation reports 2013 vs 2022).

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of dual-channel claims through CORSIA (registry record). Nonetheless, the large discrepancy in emission reduction figures across validation documents (256,089 vs 80,706) increases the risk that public claims could be overstated or confusing to buyers (validation reports 2022-09-02 vs 2013-12-30). CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on that screening signal here.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 27 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Corrective action(s) were required to revise project coordinates and methodology version, indicating documentation control issues (monitoring/verification record, 2022).

The extracted record indicates a broad evidence base (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and a relatively high document count (27) with high extraction confidence, which supports document completeness. At the same time, the monitoring/verification record notes corrective action(s) to revise project coordinates and the methodology version in the PDD and monitoring report, indicating prior inconsistencies in core project descriptors (monitoring report, 2022). Contradictions across different dated monitoring reports on safeguards/FPIC/grievance also suggest uneven documentation over time.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
Leakage	Leakage not addressed / no deduction stated
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistently documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear reconciliation table explaining why emission reduction figures differ across the 2013 and 2022 validation documents, and link the final issued volume to the specific monitoring period and calculation inputs.

→ Add explicit leakage assessment and justification (even if concluded negligible) with a stated leakage deduction (e.g., 0%) consistent with ACM0002 requirements and the monitoring report.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-03DB694E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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