

QUALITY REPORT

HEBEI YUXIAN KONGZHONGCAOYUAN 49.5MW WIND FARM PROJECT

VCS-413 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-A98349E4 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS wind project shows some core integrity strengths (VVB-confirmed investment additionality and a standard grid-connected renewable methodology), but several internal inconsistencies and unresolved issues weaken confidence in the quantified results. Leakage treatment and key quantitative outputs (verified ERs and crediting period start) are contradictory across documents, increasing over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-413
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2016, 2021
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2018 — 2028
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	49,572 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Verified emission reductions are inconsistent across validation documents (49,572 vs 508,734), creating material uncertainty in credited volumes.
- Leakage treatment is contradictory (one document indicates leakage was not addressed while another indicates it was quantified), undermining MRV consistency.
- Crediting period start date is inconsistent (2018 vs 2008), affecting eligibility and volume calculations.
- Multiple corrective actions relate to emission factor selection and ER recalculation, indicating prior quantification weaknesses.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Baseline/leakage quantification reliability is weakened by contradictions and corrective actions related to grid emission factors and ER recalculation.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation/verification record confirms an investment test and states it was confirmed by the VVB. However, integrity is weakened by multiple corrective actions tied to quantification choices (including grid emission factor consistency and revising emission reduction figures) noted in the monitoring/validation documentation. Leakage is a particular weakness because the monitoring report indicates it was not addressed, while the validation report indicates it was quantified, which undermines confidence in the completeness of the baseline-and-project boundary accounting.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

- + The project identifies the VVB (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. / Applus+ Certification) and provides a defined monitoring period (2021-12-01 to 2022-05-31).
- Claimed ERs were not found in the extracted record, and verified ERs are contradictory across validation documents, reducing transparency of the accounting.

The project provides key MRV identifiers such as the VVB name (Applus+) and a clear monitoring period (2021-12-01—2022-05-31) in the monitoring report (2022). Transparency is reduced because the claimed ER total was not found in the extracted record, making it hard to reconcile what was requested versus what was issued. In addition, contradictory verified ER figures across validation documents reduce the audit trail clarity for stakeholders.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.
- Over-crediting risk is elevated by conflicting ER totals and emission factor-related corrective actions, plus inconsistent leakage treatment.

The project is listed as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims. Nonetheless, claim safety is constrained by over-crediting uncertainty: the validation documentation contains two very different verified ER totals (49,572 vs 508,734), and corrective actions explicitly call for recalculation and revision of emission reduction figures based on emission factor conservativeness. The leakage inconsistency (not addressed vs quantified) further increases the risk that credited reductions are not consistently calculated across reporting cycles.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

- + A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 20 documents used.
- Numerous corrective actions (including ER figure revisions and PDD completeness issues) indicate documentation/QA weaknesses in earlier iterations.

Documentation coverage is fairly strong in breadth (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and the extraction confidence is high, suggesting the underlying documents were readable. However, the presence of many corrective actions (e.g., PDD revision history, GPS coordinate provenance, training and implementation schedules, and multiple ER/emission factor clarifications) indicates that earlier documentation was incomplete or inconsistent and required significant remediation. These issues reduce confidence that all key parameters were consistently controlled across versions.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent across documents
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reported in later docs but inconsistent historically
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled ER accounting table that ties monitoring data to the final verified/issued volume, explicitly resolving the 49,572 vs 508,734 discrepancy with document/version references.

→ Standardize leakage treatment and explicitly document the leakage assessment (or justified 0% deduction) consistently across the PDD, monitoring report, and validation/verification reports, including any quantified deduction if applicable.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- 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-A98349E4 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy