

QUALITY REPORT

Shandong Yishui Tangwangshan Wind Farm Project

VCS-1187 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-A4B9D204 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.1 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected wind project under ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no material findings reported in the latest monitoring/verification record. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (crediting period, grid emission factor, and verified ERs) and several corrective actions raise reliability and over-crediting risk concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1187
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2020 — 2030
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	40,887 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	27 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large inconsistency in verified emission reductions between the monitoring report (40,887) and the validation report (127,933), indicating potential misreporting or period/scope mismatch.
- Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2010–2020 vs 2020–2030), creating uncertainty about eligibility and the correct issuance window.
- Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction while leakage is not addressed/justified in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed using an investment test and confirmed by the VVB.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record; leakage is not addressed despite a 0% deduction in the monitoring report (2022).

The project applies ACM0002 with a project-specific baseline approach, and additionality is supported via an investment test confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification record). Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction, but leakage is not addressed/justified in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2022-10-28), which weakens robustness. No material findings are reported, but the presence of multiple corrective actions (including start-date and metering/calibration clarifications) suggests implementation/MRV weaknesses that can affect integrity (monitoring report, 2022-10-28).

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + Key MRV elements are present (named VVB Applus+, stated monitoring period 2020-05-05 to 2021-12-31, and both claimed and verified ER figures are available in the monitoring report dated 2022-10-28).

- Several corrective actions and internal inconsistencies (meters/calibration details requested; start-date inconsistencies) reduce confidence in MRV clarity (monitoring report, 2022-10-28).

The monitoring period (2020-05-05 to 2021-12-31), VVB identity (Applus+), and both claimed and verified ER totals are disclosed in the monitoring report dated 2022-10-28, supporting basic transparency. However, the monitoring report lists several corrective actions, including requests to state calibration information for all electricity meters and to resolve start-date inconsistencies, which reduces MRV clarity and comparability. The extracted record also shows conflicting values across documents (e.g., grid emission factor and ER totals), which undermines transparent, consistent reporting.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.
- Contradictory grid emission factors and ER figures across documents increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk (monitoring report 2022 vs validation report 2021).

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims based on these credits (extracted record). Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictions in key quantification inputs and outputs: the grid emission factor differs between the monitoring report (2022-10-28) and the validation report (2021-05-26), and verified ERs differ sharply across documents. With CCP status not stated in the extracted record, buyers have less assurance about alignment with higher-integrity labels.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

- + A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 26 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Multiple corrective actions (including LoAs and start-date clarifications) indicate documentation gaps that required remediation (monitoring report, 2022-10-28).

The extracted record indicates a broad evidence base (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and 26 documents used, with high extraction confidence, which supports a solid documentation score. Nonetheless, the monitoring report (2022-10-28) includes multiple corrective actions (including LoA requests and metering/start-date clarifications), implying that key documentation elements were incomplete or inconsistent at audit time. These issues reduce confidence that the documentation is consistently complete across the project lifecycle.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● Leakage	0% deduction but leakage not justified
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent across years
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear reconciliation table across documents showing the correct crediting period, monitoring period boundaries, grid emission factor source/year, and how these lead to the final verified ERs for each issuance event.

→ Publish/attach complete metering and calibration records for all electricity meters for the monitored period and document the resolution/closure evidence for all corrective actions (including LoAs and start-date clarifications).

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- 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-A4B9D204 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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