QUALITY REPORT

Hebei Shirenshan Wind Power Project

VCS-277 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-68186EFF · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.1 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS wind project is supported by a VVB-confirmed additionality conclusion and a clear monitoring period with verified ERs. However, baseline setting is project-specific with no documented reassessment timing, and leakage treatment is not addressed in the extracted record, which increases over-crediting uncertainty.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-277
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 06
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	China Classification Society Certification Co., Ltd.
Verified ERs	614,637 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no justification and no stated deduction), despite being a required element of MRV completeness.
- Baseline approach is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated, increasing baseline robustness risk over a long crediting period.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the record).

- Leakage treatment is not addressed in the extracted record and baseline reassessment timing is not stated.

The extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness for a grid-connected wind project. The baseline is described as project-specific, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens confidence over a long crediting period (2008-02-18 to 2018-02-17). Leakage is explicitly not addressed in the extracted record and no leakage deduction is stated, creating an integrity gap even if leakage is likely low for wind.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Verified emission reductions are stated (614,637 tCO■e) and the monitoring period is clearly defined (monitoring report dated 2022-08-06).

- Total ERs claimed are not found in the extracted record, limiting cross-checking of claimed vs verified figures.

The monitoring report (dated 2022-08-06) provides a clearly bounded monitoring period (2012-05-01 to 2018-02-17) and reports verified ERs of 614,637 tCO■e, which supports traceability. The VVB is identified as China Classification Society Certification Co., Ltd., improving audit transparency. However, total ERs claimed are not found in the extracted record, reducing the ability to reconcile claimed versus verified outcomes.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ Uses an established grid-connected renewable methodology (ACM0002 v06), which generally has standardized MRV expectations.

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage treatment is not addressed, raising buyer claim and over-crediting risk.

The project applies ACM0002 (version 06), a widely used methodology for grid-connected renewable electricity, which generally reduces methodological ambiguity. That said, the extracted record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so downstream claims (e.g., CORSIA-aligned or CCP-aligned) cannot be safely inferred. In addition, leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, which increases perceived over-crediting/quality risk for buyers even if practical leakage is minimal.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ Multiple core document types are referenced (validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

~ One evidence document is listed as unknown, and some key quantifications (e.g., claimed ERs, leakage deduction) are missing from the extracted record.

The evidence set includes key document types (validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, indicating the underlying documents were readable and usable. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is consistent with a clean assurance outcome. Some important fields remain missing (e.g., total ERs claimed, leakage deduction), and one evidence document is categorized as unknown, preventing a higher documentation score.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality
● **Permanence**	No reversal risk indicated for wind
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed in record
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and/or extract the explicit leakage assessment and any leakage deduction (even if 0%) from the monitoring/verification documentation, with a clear justification.

→ Provide the additionality test type and any baseline reassessment details (including the grid EF vintage/year used) to strengthen baseline credibility and buyer confidence.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-68186EFF · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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