

QUALITY REPORT

# Larimar Wind Farm Project

VCS-1644 · Verified Carbon Standard · Dominican Republic

Report ID: CM-3D8277D2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

|                                                              |                       |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| <div>6.3</div> <div>Overall Score</div> <div>out of 10</div> | ■ 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 renewable energy project using ACM0002 with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no material findings reported, which supports basic credit integrity. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (ERR totals, grid emission factor, and whether safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit sharing are documented) and unresolved corrective action requests around the grid emission factor reduce confidence and increase over-crediting and reporting-risk.

## Project Details

|                     |                          |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Registry            | Verified Carbon Standard |
| Registry ID         | VCS-1644                 |
| Sector              | renewable_energy         |
| Country             | Dominican Republic       |
| Vintage             | 2023                     |
| Project Methodology | ACM0002 17.0             |
| Crediting Period    | 2016 — 2026              |
| VVB                 | Verifit                  |
| Verified ERs        | 441,100 tCO2e            |
| Monitoring Period   | 2022 — 2023              |
| Confidence          | High                     |
| Documents Reviewed  | 23 documents reviewed    |
| Scored              | 2026-04-02               |

## Red Flags

- ERR totals conflict across validation reports (441,100 vs 581,384), indicating potential over-/under-crediting or document control issues
- Grid emission factor values are inconsistent across documents and a corrective action explicitly flags incoherence in the registered PDD's EFgrid value

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The verification/monitoring record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (monitoring record, 2024).

- Corrective action requests flag incoherent grid emission factor values in the registered PDD/spreadsheet, which can materially affect baseline emissions (monitoring report, 2024-08-29).

The project applies ACM0002 (version 17.0) with a project-specific baseline approach, and the extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (monitoring report, 2024-08-29). Integrity is weakened by corrective action requests stating the grid combined margin emission factor in the registered PDD is incoherent with another PDD section and the calculation spreadsheet, which can directly affect credited emission reductions (monitoring report, 2024-08-29). Leakage is recorded as a 0% deduction, but the justification is inconsistent across documents, adding uncertainty to completeness of accounting.

### Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are present (methodology ACM0002 v17.0, monitoring period 2022–2023, VVB named Verifit, and claimed equals verified ERR in the extracted record) (monitoring report, 2024-08-29).

- Multiple contradictions across official documents (ERR totals, safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit sharing, leakage justification) reduce transparency and traceability.

The monitoring period is clearly stated (2022-01-01 to 2023-12-31), the VVB is identified as Verifit, and the extracted record shows claimed and verified ERR match at 441,100 for the period (monitoring report, 2024-08-29). Transparency is reduced by repeated contradictions between validation/monitoring documents on key disclosures (ERR totals, leakage treatment narrative, and whether safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit sharing are documented), which makes it harder for third parties to reconcile the public record.

### Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, lowering aviation-claim and double-claim channel risk (registry extract).

- Conflicting ERR totals and grid emission factor discrepancies elevate over-crediting and greenwashing risk for end-claims (validation reports 2017/2020/2024; monitoring report 2024-08-29).

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-stakes aviation claims and some double-claim concerns (registry extract). Claim safety is nonetheless constrained by over-crediting risk signals: ERR totals differ materially between validation reports (581,384 vs 441,100) and grid emission factor values vary across documents, with a corrective action explicitly flagging incoherence in EFgrid reporting (validation reports 2017/2020/2024; monitoring report, 2024-08-29). CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving an evidence gap for CCP-aligned claims.

### Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 18 documents used (extracted record).

- The presence of multiple corrective action requests and internal inconsistencies across documents suggests documentation quality/control issues (monitoring report, 2024-08-29).

The extracted record references a broad evidence set (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 18 documents used and high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation score. However, the monitoring report lists multiple corrective action requests and clarifications, and several fields contradict between documents (including safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit sharing), indicating document control and consistency issues that should be resolved for a stronger audit trail.

## Risk Indicators

|                        |                                                        |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| ● <b>Additionality</b> | VVB-confirmed investment test                          |
| ● <b>Permanence</b>    | Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated          |
| ● <b>Leakage</b>       | 0% leakage with inconsistent justification             |
| ● <b>Baseline</b>      | Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear |
| ● <b>Safeguards</b>    | Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistently documented    |
| ● <b>Double-claim</b>  | Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not found              |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note explaining why ERR totals differ across validation/monitoring documents (581,384 vs 441,100) and which figure applies to which period and issuance.

→ Resolve the EFgrid incoherence flagged in corrective actions by updating/aligning the PDD sections and calculation spreadsheet, and disclose the final EFgrid value used for crediting with references.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- 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-3D8277D2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)