QUALITY REPORT

# Inner Mongolia Chao’Er Improved Forest Management Project

VCS-1529 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-A5B48B29 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.8**

Overall Score

out of 10

| | |
|---|---|
| Integrity (35%) | 4.7 |
| Transparency (25%) | 6.0 |
| Claim Safety (25%) | 6.4 |
| Documentation (15%) | 6.8 |

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

## Assessment Summary

This IFM project shows several integrity strengths typical of VCS forestry, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a sizeable buffer contribution with no reversals reported. However, leakage treatment is weak (0% deduction with inconsistent/absent justification), and multiple cross-document inconsistencies (buffer %, safeguards/FPIC, and verified ERs) reduce confidence in the reliability of key claims.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Registry | Verra (VCS) |
| Registry ID | VCS-1529 |
| Sector | redd |
| Country | China |
| Vintage | Stale |
| Project Methodology | VM0010 1.2 |
| Crediting Period | 2010 — 2029 |
| VVB | CHINA QUALITY CERTIFICATION CENTER |
| Verified ERs | 343,998 tCO2e |
| Monitoring Period | 2015 — 2019 |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 15 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-02 |

## Red Flags

■ Leakage deduction of 0% while leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, and another document version says leakage was “negligible” without a consistent, retained justification.

■ Conflicting figures for buffer contribution (23% vs 10%) and for verified emission reductions (343,998 vs 380,247), indicating document/version control issues.

■ Leakage not addressed in project documentation

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.7 / 10

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

- Leakage is treated as 0% with justification either missing or inconsistent across monitoring documents (monitoring reports).

The validation documentation confirms additionality via an investment test and indicates it was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. Permanence management appears reasonably strong for a VCS IFM project, with a reported buffer contribution and no reversals reported in monitoring. Integrity is weakened by leakage: the monitoring record shows a 0% leakage deduction while leakage is either not addressed or only asserted as negligible in an older monitoring version, leaving the basis for zero deduction unclear.

### Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are present (named VVB, monitoring period 2015–2019, and a verified ER figure reported) (monitoring/validation documentation).

- The claimed ER total is not found in the extracted record, and the verified ER figure conflicts across validation report versions.

The extracted record includes a named VVB (China Quality Certification Center), a clear monitoring period (2015–2019), and a verified ER quantity reported in validation documentation, which supports basic transparency. However, the total ER claimed is not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to reconcile claimed vs verified outcomes. Transparency is further reduced by conflicting verified ER totals across validation report versions, suggesting versioning or reporting inconsistencies.

### Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (registry extract).

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by inconsistent verified ER totals and weak leakage substantiation (validation/monitoring documents).

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of problematic aviation-related claims. Claim safety is nonetheless constrained by potential over-crediting signals: the verified ER total differs across validation report versions, and leakage is effectively set to zero without a stable, well-documented justification in the extracted record. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving an additional quality/eligibility signal unresolved.

### Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (12 documents including PDD, monitoring and validation reports) with high extraction confidence.

- Multiple internal inconsistencies across document dates/versions (buffer %, safeguards/FPIC, ER totals) reduce document reliability.

Documentation coverage is fairly strong: multiple document types are referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report) and the extraction confidence is high, suggesting the underlying files were readable. The record also notes corrective actions during validation that were closed, indicating some quality control. Still, repeated contradictions across document dates/versions (buffer %, safeguards/FPIC, and ER totals) reduce confidence that the documentation set is internally consistent and up to date.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| **Additionality** | VVB-confirmed investment test |
| **Permanence** | Buffer in place; no reversals reported |
| **Leakage** | 0% deduction with weak/inconsistent justification |
| **Baseline** | Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear |
| **Safeguards** | Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent across versions |
| **Double-claim** | Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not found |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, methodology-aligned leakage assessment (and evidence) supporting the 0% leakage deduction, or apply a quantified deduction if warranted, and keep it consistent across monitoring versions.

→ Publish/clarify a single authoritative set of figures for buffer contribution and verified ERs (with version control and registry cross-references) to resolve discrepancies across validation/monitoring documents.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Review Report
- AFOLU Project Element
- Registration Representation
- AFOLU Project Element Assessment
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report



Report ID: CM-A5B48B29 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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