QUALITY REPORT

Jiangsu Dongtai Phase II Wind Power Project

VCS-1356 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-9D613047 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3 Overall Score out of 10		
	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.4
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS wind power project using ACM0002 with VVB-confirmed additionality and a recent monitoring package, but several internal inconsistencies across documents reduce confidence. Key MRV elements (grid EF basis and verified ER totals) show discrepancies and required corrections, increasing over-crediting and reliability risk despite generally good document availability.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1356
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2017
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2010 — 2030
VVB	China Classification Society Certification Co., Ltd.
Verified ERs	956,291 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	23 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Verified emission reductions differ materially between two validation reports (2019 vs 2022), indicating potential MRV/issuance inconsistency.
- ■ Crediting period start date is inconsistent across documents (2010 vs 2020), creating uncertainty about eligible vintage and issuance boundaries.
- ■ Corrective actions cite inconsistencies in grid emission factor determination and project scale classification, which can directly affect credited volumes.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring/verification package (2022).

- Corrective actions in the 2022 monitoring package flag inconsistencies in grid EF determination and project scale classification, which can affect baseline emissions and ER integrity.

The project applies ACM0002 (version 20.0) with a project-specific baseline approach and a stated grid emission factor of 0.8325 (monitoring report, 2022). Additionality is described as an investment test and is confirmed by the VVB in the 2022 monitoring/verification package, supporting additionality robustness. However, the 2022 monitoring report lists corrective actions requiring revision of the grid EF determination approach and notes inconsistencies in annual ER figures and project scale classification, which can directly affect baseline emissions and credited ER volumes. Leakage is reported with a 0% deduction and described as quantified in the 2022 monitoring report, but earlier monitoring documentation (2019) indicates leakage was not addressed, reducing confidence in consistent application over time.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

+ Core MRV parameters are disclosed (monitoring period 2018-11-01—2022-07-31; grid EF 0.8325; methodology ACM0002 v20.0) in the 2022 monitoring report.

- Conflicting ER totals across validation reports (2019 vs 2022) reduce clarity on what was actually verified.

The monitoring period (2018-11-01—2022-07-31), methodology, and key baseline parameter (grid EF) are disclosed in the 2022 monitoring report, and the VVB is identified as China Classification Society Certification Co., Ltd. The extracted record includes both claimed ER (2,366,077) and verified ER figures, but the verified total is inconsistent across validation reports (2019 vs 2022), which undermines transparency on the final verified quantity. Safeguards-related disclosures (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) appear in the 2022 monitoring report but are contradicted by an earlier monitoring report (2014), suggesting uneven disclosure quality across vintages.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, lowering aviation-claim double-claiming risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictions in verified ER totals and by corrective actions related to grid EF calculation and annual ER figures.

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, which reduces the risk of aviation-related double claiming. Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened by MRV inconsistencies: the verified ER total differs materially between the 2019 and 2022 validation reports, and the 2022 monitoring report’s corrective actions highlight issues with grid EF determination and mismatches in stated annual ER versus the registered PDD. Leakage treatment is also inconsistent across monitoring reports (2019 vs 2022), increasing the risk that public claims could overstate conservativeness.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

+ A relatively large document set is available (19 documents including PDD, monitoring reports, validation report, and issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Multiple cross-document contradictions (safeguards, leakage treatment, crediting period, ER totals) indicate record-keeping and consistency weaknesses.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the extracted record references the PDD, multiple monitoring reports, validation report(s), and issuance, with 19 documents used and high extraction confidence. However, the presence of multiple contradictions across documents (safeguards, leakage justification, additionality verification status, crediting period, and verified ER totals) indicates weaknesses in document consistency and version control. Corrective actions recorded in the 2022 monitoring report further suggest that key sections required revision to align with applicable grid EF references and VCS requirements.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test (latest package)
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● **Leakage**	0% leakage but inconsistent treatment across reports
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; EF approach required correction
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards reported recently but contradicted historically
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note linking each issuance/verification vintage to a single verified ER total and explaining why the 2019 vs 2022 validation figures differ.

→ Resolve the crediting period start-date inconsistency across documents and update registry-facing documentation to reflect the definitive crediting period and eligible monitoring vintages.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-9D613047 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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