QUALITY REPORT

49.5 MW Wind Power Project by FFCEL in Pakistan

VCS-1346 · VCS · Pakistan

Report ID: CM-16F89D06 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
5.5 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.8
	Transparency (25%)	5.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
	Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record shows important reliability issues around emissions reductions figures and leakage treatment, and the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which limits claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1346
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Pakistan
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 15.0
Crediting Period	2013 — 2023
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A.
Verified ERs	77,293 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The emissions reductions figures conflict across validation documents, with a much higher claimed amount in the later record than in earlier records.
- Leakage is described as not addressed in the monitoring report, while the validation report later says it is negligible, creating a documentation inconsistency.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a first-of-its-kind test, which is stronger than an unverified project claim.

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the monitoring report says it was not addressed, while the validation report later calls it negligible.

The project benefits from VVB-confirmed additionality through a first-of-its-kind test, and the validation record reports no material findings. Still, the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while the later validation report describes leakage as negligible, so the evidence is mixed and slightly weakens confidence in the crediting setup.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period, and the monitoring report includes a detailed list of corrective actions.

- The record does not state a usage monitoring method, and the emissions reductions totals differ across validation documents.

The project has a named verifier, a clear monitoring period, and a substantial set of extracted documents, which supports basic transparency. But the record does not state a usage monitoring method, and the emissions reductions totals are inconsistent across validation documents, which reduces reporting clarity.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

+ The project is a wind power activity under ACM0002 with a project baseline, which is generally lower risk than many land-use crediting cases.

- The project is not CORSIA-eligible, and the conflicting emissions reductions figures raise over-crediting concerns.

This is a renewable electricity project with a project baseline, which is generally safer than many offset types. Even so, the project is not CORSIA-eligible, and the conflicting emissions reductions figures suggest some over-crediting risk that should temper confidence in the claim.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ The extracted record draws on many documents, including issuance, PDD, validation, and monitoring materials, with high extraction confidence.

- Several key items are not stated, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and usage monitoring details.

Documentation coverage is reasonably broad, with 21 documents used and high extraction confidence. However, several important fields are missing or not stated, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and usage monitoring details, and the monitoring report still required multiple editorial corrections.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed first-of-its-kind test
● **Permanence**	Wind project with no reversal events reported
● **Leakage**	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● **Baseline**	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● **Safeguards**	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing documented
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled emissions reductions table that explains the differences between the validation and monitoring figures and clearly identifies the authoritative value.

→ State a quantified leakage treatment, baseline reassessment schedule, and a documented usage monitoring method in the public record.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-16F89D06 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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