QUALITY REPORT

# Guohua Wulate Zhongqi Phase I 49.5 MW Wind Farm Project

VCS-1204 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-E8A7DDC8 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**6.3**

Overall Score

out of 10

| | |
|---|---|
| Integrity (35%) | 6.2 |
| Transparency (25%) | 6.0 |
| Claim Safety (25%) | 6.4 |
| Documentation (15%) | 7.2 |

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a VCS wind project using ACM0002 with VVB-confirmed additionality and a clear monitoring period, and the claimed and verified ERs match in the latest monitoring record. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (ER totals, grid emission factor, crediting period, and safeguards/leakage statements) reduce confidence in baseline/MRV reliability and increase over-crediting and reputational risk.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Registry | Verra (VCS) |
| Registry ID | VCS-1204 |
| Sector | renewable_energy |
| Country | China |
| Vintage | Aging |
| Project Methodology | ACM0002 20.0 |
| Crediting Period | 2019 — 2029 |
| VVB | China Classification Society Certification Co., Ltd. |
| Verified ERs | 349,762 tCO2e |
| Monitoring Period | 2019 — 2022 |
| Confidence | High |
| Documents Reviewed | 35 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-02 |

## Red Flags

■ Large inconsistencies across documents for verified ERs (349,762 vs 811,737) and claimed ERs (349,762 vs 78,402), indicating data reliability issues.

■ Grid emission factor differs materially between documents (0.84045 vs 1.0755), which can significantly affect credited reductions.

■ Crediting period dates conflict across monitoring reports (2019–2029 vs 2009–2031), raising concerns about period alignment and eligibility boundaries.

■ Safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are inconsistently reported across monitoring reports, increasing social-risk uncertainty.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

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

- Baseline/MRV inputs show material inconsistencies across documents (notably grid emission factor and ER totals), increasing over-crediting risk.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record). The project applies a project-specific baseline under ACM0002, but the baseline input (grid emission factor) is inconsistent between a 2019 monitoring report and a 2022 validation report (1.0755 vs 0.84045), which can materially change ERs. Leakage is reported as a 0% deduction with a quantified justification in the 2022 monitoring report, but an earlier monitoring report states leakage was not addressed, weakening confidence in consistent application. No reversal buffer is stated (not typically applicable for wind), and no reversal events are reported in the extracted record.

### Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are present in the extracted record (methodology ACM0002 v20.0, monitoring period 2019-08-01 to 2022-07-31, and matching claimed vs verified ERs in the latest monitoring record).

- Multiple contradictions across monitoring/validation documents reduce transparency and make it hard to reconcile what was actually monitored and verified.

The latest monitoring record provides a clear monitoring period (2019-08-01 to 2022-07-31) and shows claimed ERs equal verified ERs (both 349,762) in that record. The VVB is identified as China Classification Society Certification Co., Ltd., supporting traceability of assurance. However, transparency is undermined by multiple contradictions across monitoring/validation documents on core quantitative parameters (ER totals, grid emission factor) and even the crediting period dates, making reconciliation difficult for an external reviewer.

### Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim and double-claim channel risk.

- Conflicting ER totals and grid emission factors across documents elevate greenwashing/over-crediting risk even if the latest figures reconcile internally.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of aviation-related double claiming; CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving some uncertainty for broader integrity labeling. Over-crediting risk is elevated because the grid emission factor differs substantially across documents (0.84045 vs 1.0755) and because verified ER totals conflict between validation reports (349,762 vs 811,737). While the latest monitoring report shows internal consistency (claimed equals verified), the cross-document inconsistencies increase greenwashing risk for public claims.

### Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is indicated (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 28 documents used.

- Corrective actions were required (date-period correction in the monitoring report), and repeated cross-document inconsistencies suggest document control issues.

The extracted record indicates a reasonably complete documentation package (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and a high extraction confidence across 28 documents. Nonetheless, corrective actions were required to fix an incorrect reported period in the monitoring report, indicating quality-control issues. In addition, repeated contradictions across documents (including safeguards and key quantitative parameters) suggest document versioning or reporting inconsistencies that reduce documentary reliability.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| ● **Additionality** | VVB-confirmed investment test |
| ● **Permanence** | Avoidance project; no reversal events indicated |
| ● **Leakage** | 0% leakage but inconsistent treatment across reports |
| ● **Baseline** | Project-specific baseline; key parameters inconsistent |
| ● **Safeguards** | Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent historically |
| ● **Double-claim** | Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciliation note mapping each ER figure (78,402; 349,762; 811,737) to specific monitoring periods, issuance events, and document versions, and correct any superseded documents on the registry.

→ Provide a clear, consistent grid emission factor derivation (data sources, year(s), calculation steps) and confirm which value was applied for each monitoring period, with VVB confirmation.

→ Clarify and standardize the crediting period dates across all project documents and registry entries, including an explanation for any renewal or re-registration.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Project Description
- Validation / Verification Report
- 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-E8A7DDC8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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