

QUALITY REPORT

Guohua Rongcheng Phase II Wind Farm Project

VCS-1301 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-D24A8F5C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS wind project has VVB-confirmed additionality and a recent monitoring/verification package, but several cross-document inconsistencies (ERR totals, grid emission factor, and even the crediting period) weaken confidence in the quantified results. Leakage treatment is weakly evidenced in the latest monitoring record, and multiple corrective actions indicate earlier documentation and eligibility gaps that required remediation.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1301
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2020 — 2030
VVB	CCSC
Verified ERs	173,441 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	28 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Major inconsistencies across reports on verified/claimed ERs (173,441 vs 68,535 vs 88,413) and on the grid emission factor (0.8269 vs 0.9502), increasing over-crediting risk.
- Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring records (2010–2020 vs 2020–2030), creating uncertainty about what period the ERs relate to.
- Latest monitoring record does not address leakage justification while applying a 0% leakage deduction.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation report, 2023).

- Baseline/quantification reliability is weakened by contradictions in grid emission factor and ER totals across validation reports (2022 vs 2023).

The validation report (2023-05-15) confirms additionality via an investment test, which supports additionality robustness. However, quantification integrity is undermined by contradictions between validation reports on both the grid emission factor (0.9502 in 2022-12-19 vs 0.8269 in 2023-05-15) and the verified ER total (68,535 in 2022-12-19 vs 173,441 in 2023-05-15). Leakage is applied as a 0% deduction, but the latest monitoring report (2023-05-13) does not provide a leakage justification, weakening confidence in the leakage assessment.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are present (methodology ACM0002 v20.0, monitoring period 2020–2022, VVB identified as CCSC) in the 2023 monitoring/validation package.

- Conflicting figures and periods across documents reduce traceability of what was actually monitored and verified.

The monitoring report (2023-05-13) provides a clear monitoring period (2020-06-30 to 2022-07-31) and the project uses a well-known grid-connected renewable methodology (ACM0002 v20.0). The VVB is identified (CCSC) and the extracted record includes both claimed and verified ERs for the current package. Transparency is reduced by conflicting ER totals and crediting-period statements across documents, making it harder for third parties to reconcile what was verified for which period.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ Project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (registry extract).

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by inconsistent ER totals and changing grid emission factors across validation reports (2022 vs 2023).

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of aviation-related double-claim pathways. Nonetheless, the large spread in ER totals across validation reports (88,413 in 2014; 68,535 in 2022; 173,441 in 2023) and the change in grid emission factor between 2022 and 2023 increase perceived over-crediting/greenwashing risk unless clearly explained in the public record. Leakage treatment is also a weak point because the latest monitoring report does not address leakage justification while still applying 0% leakage deduction.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Document set is relatively complete (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 25 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Multiple corrective actions (including LoA/MoC and grid EF procedure alignment) indicate earlier documentation/eligibility weaknesses that required fixes (monitoring report, 2023).

The extracted record indicates a relatively robust document set (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 25 documents used and high extraction confidence. However, the monitoring report (2023-05-13) lists multiple corrective actions, including alignment of the grid EF procedure with China DNA guidance and requests related to LoA/MoC and CDM consideration evidence, indicating earlier documentation gaps. These issues do not necessarily invalidate the project, but they reduce confidence that the documentation trail has been consistently strong over time.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● Leakage	0% leakage with weak/contradictory justification
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; EF/approach disputed across reports
● Safeguards	Safeguards reported but inconsistent over time
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note explaining why ER totals and the grid emission factor differ across the 2014, 2022, and 2023 validation/verification records (including which monitoring periods and parameters changed).

→ Provide an explicit leakage assessment consistent with ACM0002 requirements (even if negligible) in the latest monitoring report, with a documented justification for the 0% leakage deduction.

→ Clarify the applicable crediting period and how it maps to the monitoring period and issuance, to remove ambiguity between the 2010–2020 and 2020–2030 statements.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Review Report
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation 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-D24A8F5C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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