QUALITY REPORT

Guazhou Beidaqiao No.1 Wind Farm Project In Gansu Province, China

VCS-1037 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-0109DC3C · 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%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS wind project using ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the extracted record. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (including verified ERs and crediting period dates) and weak/unclear leakage treatment reduce confidence and increase over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1037
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2011 — 2032
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	452,938 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	24 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Large inconsistency in verified emission reductions across validation reports (452,938 vs 796,594), indicating data reliability risk.

■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the monitoring report does not address leakage justification while the validation report indicates leakage was quantified, yet a 0% leakage deduction is applied.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed using an investment test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the merged record).

- Leakage is applied as 0% with inconsistent justification across documents, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record.

Additionality appears reasonably supported: the extracted record indicates the VVB confirmed additionality using an investment test (validation/verification documentation). The baseline is project-specific under ACM0002, but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens robustness over a long crediting period. Leakage is scored down because the monitoring report (2022-09-27) does not address leakage justification while a validation report (2022-09-28) indicates leakage was quantified, yet the applied leakage deduction is 0%. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is a positive signal for implementation quality.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are present (VVB identified as Applus+, monitoring period 2021-03-01 to 2022-08-31, and a stated grid emission factor of 0.92928).

- Reported ER numbers are inconsistent across documents, reducing transparency and auditability of the final credited quantity.

The extracted record provides core MRV identifiers: the VVB is Applus+ Certification, the monitoring period is 2021-03-01 to 2022-08-31, and a grid emission factor of 0.92928 is reported in the monitoring documentation (2022-09-27). However, transparency is reduced by conflicting ER figures across validation reports, making it difficult to trace which number is ultimately used for issuance without further reconciliation. Public-facing completeness is otherwise moderate given the presence of PDD, monitoring, validation, and issuance in the evidence list.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain double-claiming/dual-channel risks.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictions in verified ERs and unclear leakage justification despite a 0% deduction.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain aviation-related double claiming. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity labels. The largest claim-safety concern is potential over-crediting driven by inconsistent verified ER totals across validation reports and inconsistent leakage justification paired with a 0% leakage deduction. These issues increase the risk that credited volumes could be challenged by buyers or stakeholders.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 22 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Internal inconsistencies across official documents (safeguards, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, FPIC, crediting period, and ER totals) weaken document reliability.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the evidence list includes PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance, with 22 documents used and high extraction confidence. The monitoring report is dated 2022-09-27, indicating recency for the latest monitoring period. Nonetheless, multiple contradictions across official documents (including safeguards/FPIC and crediting period dates) indicate either version control problems or inconsistent reporting, which reduces confidence in the documentation set as a coherent audit trail.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal buffer needed
Leakage	0% deduction with inconsistent justification
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent over time
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; no dual-channel signal

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciliation note (or updated verification/issuance statement) clearly explaining which ER total is correct and why earlier validation figures differ, with traceable calculations for the monitoring period.

→ Provide a consistent leakage section across validation and monitoring reports (even if 0%) with explicit justification under ACM0002 and clear version control for crediting period dates and safeguards disclosures.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-0109DC3C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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