

QUALITY REPORT

Inner Mongolia Ximeng Zheligentu Wind Farm Phase I Project

VCS-849 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-0FCA0D73 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS wind power project using ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB and a clear monitoring period with matched claimed vs verified reductions in the extracted record. However, key integrity elements are weakly evidenced (notably leakage treatment and baseline reassessment timing), and multiple cross-document inconsistencies in ER figures, safeguards, and crediting period reduce confidence in the reliability of the record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-849
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2017
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2009 — 2029
VVB	Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd
Verified ERs	173,215 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	23 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large contradictions in verified/claimed emission reductions across documents (e.g., 173,215 vs 531,211) create over-crediting and data reliability risk.
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, despite methodology expectations for assessing potential leakage.
- Crediting period is inconsistent across documents (start date differs by 10 years), raising questions about eligibility and issuance boundaries.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification documentation indicates additionality was assessed using an investment test and confirmed by the VVB.

- Leakage is not addressed and neither a leakage deduction nor a justification is provided in the extracted record; baseline reassessment timing is also not stated.

The project applies ACM0002 (version 20.0) and the extracted record indicates additionality was demonstrated via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation). Baseline setting is project-specific, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline continued validity over a long crediting period. Leakage is flagged as not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, leaving a key integrity control unsubstantiated. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is positive but does not resolve the missing leakage/baseline details.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2021-05-02) provides a defined monitoring period (2018-07-21 to 2020-12-20) and the extracted record shows claimed and verified ERs matching at 173,215 tCO₂e.

- Multiple contradictions across reports (ER totals, safeguards, crediting period) reduce transparency and traceability of what was actually validated/verified.

The monitoring report dated 2021-05-02 specifies a monitoring period from 2018-07-21 to 2020-12-20, and the extracted record shows claimed and verified ERs both at 173,215 tCO₂e for that period. The VVB is identified as Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd, supporting audit traceability. However, the extracted contradictions show major inconsistencies in ER totals and other key descriptors across documents, reducing the clarity of what numbers apply to which period and decision. Public-facing completeness is therefore mixed: many fields are present, but internal consistency is weak.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Conflicting ER figures and unclear leakage treatment increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk for downstream claims.

The extracted record states the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of dual-channel aviation claims. Nonetheless, over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictions in verified ERs (including a much higher figure in a 2020 validation report) and by the absence of a stated leakage deduction or justification. The baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, which can increase the risk that credited reductions diverge from an updated grid/baseline reality over time. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving an additional uncertainty for high-integrity claim positioning.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 18 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Safeguards-related statements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) conflict between older and newer monitoring reports, indicating documentation inconsistency.

The evidence set includes a PDD, monitoring report(s), validation report(s), and issuance records, with 18 documents used and high extraction confidence, which supports a solid documentation score. The monitoring report is relatively recent (2021-05-02) compared with the monitoring period end (2020-12-20), suggesting reasonable recency. However, safeguards-related fields (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, and whether safeguards are mentioned) conflict between older (2011) and newer (2020–2021) monitoring reports, indicating inconsistent documentation over time. These inconsistencies reduce confidence that the social safeguard narrative is consistently evidenced across the project history.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed; deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent over time
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled ER table mapping each claimed/verified figure to a specific monitoring period and issuance event, with clear references to the corresponding verification statements.

→ Explicitly document leakage assessment and, if applicable, quantify and apply a leakage deduction (or provide a methodology-consistent justification for negligible leakage).

→ Clarify and evidence the correct crediting period start date across all public documents and registry records, including any renewal or re-registration history.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification 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-0FCA0D73 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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