QUALITY REPORT

Shandong Taipingshan Wind Farm Project

VCS-1189 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-56BCC8BD · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.4
Transparency (25%)	6.1
Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
Documentation (15%)	6.6

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, but several internal inconsistencies across documents raise reliability and over-crediting concerns. Leakage treatment is not addressed in the extracted record, and multiple corrective actions were raised around start dates and metering/calibration evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1189
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	124,141 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	31 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Large inconsistencies in reported/verified emission reductions across documents (e.g., verified ERs reported as 307,768 vs 124,141).

■ Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring documents (2010–2020 vs 2020–2030), creating uncertainty about eligibility and vintage boundaries.

■ Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no justification and no stated deduction).

■ Corrective actions include start-date inconsistencies and metering/calibration issues, which are central to MRV accuracy.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

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

- Baseline and key quantification inputs show inconsistencies across documents (including grid emission factor and crediting period), weakening confidence in the baseline and ER quantification.

The validation/verification record confirms additionality via an investment test and indicates it was confirmed by the VVB. However, the baseline is project-specific (ACM0002) and the extracted record does not show when the baseline was last reassessed, which is a robustness gap. Integrity is further weakened by contradictions in key quantification inputs (e.g., grid emission factor differs between the monitoring report (2022) and a validation report (2021)), and by corrective actions in the monitoring report (2022) related to start-date consistency and main meter issues.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ A named VVB is provided and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2020-04-27 to 2021-12-31) in the monitoring report (2022).

- Multiple contradictions across official documents (ER totals, safeguards fields, grid factor, crediting period) reduce transparency and traceability.

The monitoring report (2022-10-28) provides a clear monitoring period (2020-04-27 to 2021-12-31) and identifies the VVB as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification). At the same time, transparency is undermined by multiple cross-document inconsistencies (ER totals, safeguards fields, grid factor, and crediting period), making it difficult to reconcile what was actually monitored and credited. The monitoring report (2022) also lists several corrective actions requesting additional evidence (e.g., calibration details for meters), which suggests MRV documentation was not fully complete at the time of review.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

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

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by conflicting ER figures and grid emission factors across documents, plus unresolved corrective actions tied to metering and start dates.

The extracted record states the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-impact aviation-related claims. Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened by conflicting emissions reduction figures across documents (including a large discrepancy in verified ERs) and by a conflicting grid emission factor between the monitoring report (2022) and a validation report (2021), both of which can materially affect credited volumes. Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no justification and no stated deduction), which adds uncertainty even if leakage is often low for grid-connected wind projects.

Documentation — 6.6 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 27 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Numerous corrective actions were required (including LoAs, metering issues, and inconsistent dates), indicating documentation gaps at verification/issuance readiness.

The extracted record references a broad set of evidence documents (including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance) and indicates 27 documents were used with high extraction confidence. However, the monitoring report (2022) lists numerous corrective actions, including requests for DNA letters of approval, inconsistencies in key dates, and missing/unclear calibration information for meters, indicating documentation and evidentiary completeness issues. These gaps reduce confidence that all eligibility and MRV requirements were consistently evidenced across the project record.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
Leakage	Leakage not addressed in record
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards reported but inconsistent across years
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled ER accounting table that explains the differences between claimed and verified ER figures across the 2021 and 2022 documents, with clear linkage to issuance records.

→ Resolve and document the definitive crediting period and project start date with primary evidence, and ensure all monitoring meters have complete calibration/traceability information in the monitoring report.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Review Report
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report

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-56BCC8BD · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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