

QUALITY REPORT

Inner Mongolia Jingneng Saihan Wind Farm Phase I Project

VCS-850 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-C13C498B · 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%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS wind power avoidance project using ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no reported material findings. However, key accounting elements (notably leakage treatment) are not addressed in the extracted record, and multiple cross-document inconsistencies—especially around ER/ERR figures and the crediting period—raise reliability and over-crediting concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-850
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2016
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2028
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Verified ERs	229,587 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large inconsistencies in claimed and verified emission reductions across documents (e.g., 635,270 vs 122,925 claimed; 229,587 vs 635,270 verified) create over-crediting and data reliability risk.
- Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2019–2028 vs 2009–2018), which can affect eligibility and the interpretation of monitoring results.
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record, despite being a core accounting element to document explicitly.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation report).
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record (monitoring report).

The validation report indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (Bureau Veritas Certification), which supports additionality robustness. The project applies ACM0002 with a project-specific baseline approach and a stated grid emission factor of 1.0549 (monitoring report), but the baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record. Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated (monitoring report), which weakens accounting completeness even for a wind project where leakage is often treated as negligible but should still be justified.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + Key MRV elements are present (named VVB, monitoring period 2018-07-21 to 2020-12-31, grid emission factor 1.0549 with reference year 2008) (monitoring report).
- Conflicting ER/ERR and crediting-period figures across documents reduce transparency and traceability (monitoring and validation reports).

The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period (2018-07-21 to 2020-12-31), identifies the VVB (Bureau Veritas Certification), and reports the grid emission factor and reference year (monitoring report). However, the extracted record shows major inconsistencies in reported claimed and verified ER/ERR values across monitoring/validation documents, reducing traceability of what was actually issued/verified. Safeguards-related disclosures also vary across monitoring reports (2011 vs 2020/2021), which reduces confidence in consistent reporting over time.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing some downstream double-claiming/eligibility risk (registry record/extracted facts).
- Contradictory claimed vs verified ER/ERR values and shifting crediting-period dates increase greenwashing and over-crediting risk (monitoring and validation reports).

CORSIA eligibility is explicitly false, which reduces the risk of dual-channel claims tied to CORSIA (extracted record). Nonetheless, the magnitude of discrepancies between claimed and verified ER/ERR figures across documents creates a material over-crediting/greenwashing risk because users cannot easily reconcile which number is authoritative. The baseline is project-specific and the baseline reassessment date is not found in the extracted record, adding uncertainty around whether the baseline inputs remain appropriate over time.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

- + Document set is relatively complete (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with 13 documents used and high extraction confidence (extracted record).
- Safeguards and stakeholder provisions are inconsistently reported across monitoring reports (2011 vs 2020/2021), indicating documentation quality issues.

The extracted record indicates 13 documents were used and extraction confidence is high, supporting a relatively strong documentation score. Core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report), and no material findings or corrective actions are reported (validation/monitoring record). However, safeguards, grievance mechanism, FPIC, and benefit-sharing are inconsistently stated across monitoring reports from different years, which suggests uneven documentation quality and version control.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed / deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled ER/ERR table that clearly links claimed vs verified totals to the same monitoring period and explains why earlier documents show different totals.

→ Clarify and evidence the correct crediting period (start/end dates) and ensure all public documents and registry entries are consistent.

→ Explicitly document leakage treatment under ACM0002 (even if negligible) and state the leakage deduction applied (e.g., 0% with justification).

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report
- Validation 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-C13C498B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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