

QUALITY REPORT

Hebei Kangbao Wolongtushan 30 MW Wind Farm Project

VCS-148 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-C0D061C0 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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, which supports basic integrity. However, key elements are inconsistently reported across documents (notably crediting period and emissions reductions), and leakage treatment is unclear, increasing over-crediting and reliability risk. Safeguards and grievance provisions appear weak or inconsistently documented.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-148
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 06
Crediting Period	2006 — 2027
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	261,621 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large inconsistency in reported verified emissions reductions (261,621 vs 32,711) across documents, raising data reliability and over-crediting concerns
- Crediting period is inconsistent between the monitoring report (2006–2027) and the PDD (2007–2014), creating uncertainty about eligibility boundaries
- Leakage is either not addressed or deemed negligible depending on the document, with no clear quantified deduction
- Corrective actions note errors in monitoring period description and failure to subtract line losses from exported electricity, which can inflate credited generation

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed using an investment test and confirmed by the VVB.
- The monitoring report (2021) lists corrective actions including not subtracting line losses and an incorrect monitoring period description, both of which can affect credited MWh and ER integrity.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. The monitoring report (2021) includes corrective actions noting the monitoring period was incorrectly stated in the report and that line losses were not subtracted from electricity exported to the grid; both issues can materially affect credited net generation. Leakage is not consistently treated: the monitoring report (2021) shows it as not addressed, while an earlier monitoring report (2007) deems it negligible, leaving uncertainty about whether leakage was appropriately assessed.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

- + A named VVB (Applus+ Certification) and a defined monitoring period (2012-07-01 to 2016-09-29) are provided in the monitoring report (2021).
- Core quantitative disclosures are inconsistent across documents (e.g., verified ER totals and crediting period), reducing transparency and traceability.

The monitoring report (2021) provides a clear monitoring period (2012-07-01 to 2016-09-29) and identifies the VVB as Applus+ Certification, which helps auditability. However, key figures are not consistently reported across documents, including a major discrepancy in emissions reductions totals and an inconsistent crediting period, which undermines traceability. Several important fields (e.g., baseline reassessment timing and leakage deduction) are not stated in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- The project uses a project-specific baseline under ACM0002 and the timing of baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk.
- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, and ER figures are contradictory, increasing downstream claim and labeling risk.

Over-crediting risk is elevated because the monitoring report (2021) corrective actions include not subtracting line losses from exported electricity, which can inflate credited MWh. The baseline is described as project-specific and the baseline reassessment date is not stated in available documents, which weakens confidence that the baseline remains conservative over time. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily determine whether additional claim constraints or labeling expectations apply.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and extraction confidence is high.

- The presence of multiple contradictions and corrective actions indicates documentation quality/control issues despite document availability.

The extracted record includes multiple document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and a relatively high number of documents used, supporting basic completeness. Nonetheless, the monitoring report (2021) contains corrective actions indicating reporting/control weaknesses, and multiple cross-document contradictions suggest version control or data transcription issues. Safeguards documentation is mixed: safeguards are mentioned in the monitoring report (2021), but the validation report (2007) indicates they were not mentioned, and no grievance mechanism or FPIC is evidenced in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent/unclear
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistently documented; no FPIC/grievance
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled, registry-consistent statement of the crediting period and the exact monitoring/vintage boundaries used for issuance, with references to the specific VCS registration/issuance records.

→ Publish a clear leakage assessment consistent across documents (including whether leakage is negligible and why) and disclose the final net export calculation showing line-loss treatment and any resulting ER adjustments.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- 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-C0D061C0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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