QUALITY REPORT

CGN Hami Phase I 20MWp Grid-connected PV Power Plant Project

VCS-1248 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-754D2D03 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.8
	Transparency (25%)	5.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS solar project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record shows important reliability issues: the claimed and verified emission reduction figures differ sharply across documents, leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and the crediting period appears inconsistent between documents.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1248
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 13.0.0
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
VVB	Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd
Verified ERs	24,467 tCO_2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	29 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Large discrepancies in emission reduction figures across validation and monitoring documents
- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the monitoring report despite a quantified approach appearing in earlier validation material
- Crediting period dates conflict between documents, creating uncertainty about which period governs the current issuance

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which is stronger than an unverified assertion.

- The monitoring report states leakage is not addressed, and the record contains a major discrepancy between claimed and verified emission reductions.

The project’s additionality is supported because the VVB confirmed an investment test in the monitoring record, and no material findings were reported. That said, the latest monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, which weakens the integrity case for a grid-connected renewable project. The large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions also raises over-crediting concerns and reduces confidence in the accounting.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ The project has multiple official documents available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and the extraction confidence is high.

- The monitoring report does not state a usage monitoring method, and the emission reduction figures are inconsistent across documents.

Transparency is moderate because the file set includes validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance documents, and the extraction confidence is high. However, the monitoring report does not state a usage monitoring method, and the emission reduction totals vary materially across documents. Those inconsistencies make it harder to trace the final credited amount with confidence.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of dual-market claim risk.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized baseline, and the leakage treatment is weak or missing in the latest monitoring report.

Claim safety is limited by the project-specific baseline and the weak leakage treatment in the latest monitoring report. The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-market risk, but there is still a meaningful over-crediting concern because the verified reductions are far below the claimed amount. The absence of a clear, current leakage justification further lowers confidence in the claim.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ The record includes a substantial document set and the extraction confidence is high, which supports basic documentation quality.

- Corrective actions were required for incorrect coordinates and revised emission reduction estimates, and the crediting period is inconsistent across documents.

Documentation quality is fair because multiple official documents were used and the extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report required corrective actions for incorrect coordinates and revised emission reduction estimates, which indicates documentation issues. The conflicting crediting period dates between documents also suggest the record is not fully internally consistent.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed but contradicted in PDD
Permanence	Avoidance project with no reversal events reported
Leakage	Leakage not addressed in latest monitoring report
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible and no CCP approval stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions accounting table that explains the differences between claimed and verified reductions across all documents.

→ Publish a clear, current leakage assessment and a consistent statement of the applicable crediting period and baseline treatment.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-754D2D03 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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