QUALITY REPORT

University of Wisconsin Milwaukee Campus Wide Clean Energy & Energy Efficiency Project

VCS-1675 · VCS · United States

Report ID: CM-5F85607B · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	4.8
Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some integrity strengths: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, leakage was quantified at 0%, and the project is described as having no non-permanence risk. However, the verification report also records multiple material and non-material corrective actions, and the claimed and verified emission reductions differ materially from earlier figures, which weakens confidence in the crediting claim. Documentation quality is limited by low extraction confidence and missing key monitoring details.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1675
Sector	industrial
Country	United States
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VM0025 1.0
Crediting Period	2015 — 2025
VVB	Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.
Verified ERs	3,518 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2020
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

■ Material corrective actions were needed because the monitoring report did not properly disclose the use of Test C and deviated from the validated project description.

■ The claimed and verified emission reductions differ from earlier reported values, and the record shows inconsistent figures across monitoring periods.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, and the verification report says there is no non-permanence risk associated with the project.

- The verification report lists material corrective actions tied to an unreported project description deviation and a mismatch between the validated description and the emission adjustment method.

The verification report from Ruby Canyon Environmental confirms additionality through a combined test and states that there is no non-permanence risk associated with the project. Leakage was quantified with a 0% deduction, which is a positive sign for credit integrity. However, the same report records material corrective actions because the monitoring report failed to disclose that Test C was used and did not align with the validated project description, which weakens confidence in the baseline and monitoring integrity.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period, verifier name, and claimed versus verified emission reductions are stated in the verification report.

- Several core MRV details are not stated in available documents, including the monitoring method for usage, the baseline reassessment date, and the buffer pool share.

The record identifies the verifier, the monitoring period, the methodology, and both claimed and verified emission reductions, which supports some transparency. At the same time, several important MRV fields are not stated in available documents, including the usage monitoring method, the buffer pool percentage, and the baseline reassessment date. The low extraction confidence also suggests at least one key source was difficult to read, reducing documentation clarity.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ Leakage was treated as quantified with a 0% deduction, which reduces over-crediting risk on that dimension.

- The project uses a project-specific baseline, and the record contains contradictory emission reduction figures across documents, which raises over-crediting and claim reliability concerns.

Claim safety is helped by the quantified leakage treatment and the absence of reported reversal events. But the project relies on a project-specific baseline rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and the record contains contradictory emission reduction figures across documents, including earlier values of 5,210 and 4,125 versus a later verified figure of 3,518. That pattern increases the risk of over-crediting or inconsistent claim presentation.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ Seventeen documents were used, and the verification report is relatively recent, dated 2020-10-28.

- Extraction confidence is low, and the report includes several corrective actions and template/date errors, indicating documentation quality problems.

The project has a reasonably large document set, with 17 documents used, and the verification report is dated 2020-10-28. Even so, the extraction confidence is low, and the report lists multiple corrective actions, including template mismatches and an incorrect monitoring period end date in earlier materials. Those issues point to incomplete or inconsistent documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
Permanence	No non-permanence risk reported
Leakage	0% quantified deduction
Baseline	Project-specific baseline
Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned but not detailed
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a fully reconciled monitoring package that explains every deviation, updates the project description, and aligns all emission reduction totals across periods.

→ Publish complete MRV support for usage, baseline, and emissions calculations, including the missing monitoring method, reassessment timing, and underlying calculation files.

Documents Reviewed

- UWM Issuance Deed FY17 (1).pdf
- IssuanceDeed_UWM.pdf
- (UWM) Issuance of Representation_2020_Latest.pdf
- 20180418_UWMMR.pdf
- 20170728_UWMMR.pdf
- 20201028_UWM MMR FY18-FY20.pdf
- VCS Listing UWM 4-7-17.pdf
- RegistrationDeed_UWM.pdf
- APX Agency UWM 4-7-17.pdf
- 20170724_UWMPDD.pdf
- UWM 2017-2020 Verification Report Final.pdf
- UWM Verification Representation 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017.pdf
- VCS_SecondNature_UWM_ValidationRepresentation_V1-0_082917.pdf
- UWM Verification Report 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017.pdf
- VCS_SecondNature_UWM_ValVerRPT_V1-0_082917.pdf
- VCS_SecondNature_UWM_VerificationRepresentation_V1-0_082917.pdf
- UWM 2017-2020 Verification Representation Final.pdf

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-5F85607B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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