QUALITY REPORT

Inner Mongolia Jingneng Saihan Wind Farm Phase II Project

VCS-921 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-FCEE745C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.6
Transparency (25%)	6.2
Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
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 additionality confirmed by the VVB and no material findings reported, which supports basic credibility. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (including claimed vs verified ERs, leakage treatment, safeguards, and even the crediting period) raise reliability and over-crediting concerns and reduce confidence in the record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-921
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.1.0
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	395,987 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2015
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Verified ERs exceed claimed ERs (395,987 vs 379,769), indicating internal inconsistency in reported results

■ Leakage is recorded as 0% but the monitoring report does not address leakage while the validation report says it was quantified

■ Safeguards/FPIC/grievance and benefit-sharing are inconsistently reported across documents

■ Crediting period dates conflict between the monitoring report and a later validation report, creating uncertainty about the applicable crediting window

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the validation documentation, and no material findings are reported.

- Leakage is set at 0% but leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record.

The validation documentation confirms additionality, and the project applies ACM0002 with a project-specific baseline approach, which is typical for grid-connected wind. However, the monitoring report records a leakage deduction of 0% while also not addressing leakage, weakening the integrity of the emissions accounting. Baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record, and the presence of corrective actions suggests process weaknesses even if no material findings were reported.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ A named VVB (Applus+ Certification) and a clearly stated monitoring period (2009-10-27 to 2015-09-20) support traceability.

- Key figures and narratives conflict across documents (ER totals, leakage treatment, safeguards), reducing MRV clarity.

The monitoring report provides a defined monitoring period (2009-10-27 to 2015-09-20) and identifies the VVB as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification), which supports auditability. Still, transparency is undermined by inconsistent reporting across the PDD/validation/monitoring documents on core items (ER totals, leakage narrative, safeguards). The fact that verified ERs are higher than claimed ERs further reduces clarity on what was actually asserted versus checked.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, lowering aviation-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting/greenwashing risk is elevated by contradictions in ER totals and unclear leakage justification despite a 0% deduction.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation claims. Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened by contradictions in emissions reduction totals and by the mismatch between a 0% leakage deduction and inconsistent leakage treatment between the validation report and monitoring report. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity labels.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

+ A relatively large document set is referenced (14 documents across PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Corrective action requests in the monitoring documentation indicate documentation/template non-conformance that should have been resolved.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong with multiple document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and a high extraction confidence, which supports a higher documentation score. However, the monitoring documentation includes a corrective action requesting revision of the VCS project description to the most updated requirements and template, indicating documentation quality issues. Several key fields (e.g., buffer pool, baseline reassessment timing) are not found in the extracted record, limiting completeness.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Avoidance project (no reversal pool needed)
Leakage	0% leakage with inconsistent justification
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent across docs
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled ER table (claimed vs verified vs issued) with clear references and explanations for why verified ERs exceed claimed ERs.

→ Clarify leakage treatment under ACM0002 for this project and align the monitoring report narrative with the validation approach (or apply a justified deduction).

→ Resolve and document the correct crediting period dates with registry evidence and update all public-facing documents accordingly.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-FCEE745C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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