QUALITY REPORT

ACCELERATING THE ADOPTION AND USE OF ELECTRIC VEHICLES

VCS-4242 · VCS · United States

Report ID: CM-0026BB25 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	7.1
	Transparency (25%)	4.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
	Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has a reasonably solid integrity profile because additionality was confirmed by the VVB, the baseline is project-based, and no material findings were reported in validation. However, transparency is limited by missing quantified monitoring and issuance data, and claim safety is weakened by the lack of verified usage and credit figures. The main reliability issue is a contradiction on leakage treatment, where the validation report says leakage is negligible but the PDD had not addressed it; I privileged the newer validation report because it is more recent and specific.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-4242
Sector	other
Country	United States
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	VM0038 1.0
Crediting Period	2022 — 2031
VVB	SCS Global Services
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the validation report says it is negligible, while the PDD had not addressed it.
- Key MRV and issuance figures are missing, including verified emissions reductions and any usage monitoring details.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 7.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an activity-based test, which supports the project case.

- Leakage was not addressed in the PDD and only later described as negligible in validation, creating a reliability concern.

The validation report confirms additionality through an activity-based test and says the project has no material findings or required corrective actions. The baseline is project-based, which is acceptable but less robust than a recent standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and reversal risk is not clearly addressed because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool information was found. Leakage is a concern because the PDD had not addressed it, although the validation report later characterizes it as negligible.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The validation report is from 2025 and the monitoring period is clearly stated, which helps document recency.

- No verified or claimed emissions reduction totals, usage monitoring method, or usage-rate figures were found in the extracted record.

The documentation identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, and the methodology, but it does not provide verified emissions reduction totals or any claimed totals in the extracted record. Usage monitoring details are also missing, and CORSIA eligibility is not stated. That leaves the MRV trail incomplete for an external reviewer.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline and the validation report states leakage is negligible.

- Missing verified issuance and usage data make over-crediting and claim-strength assessment harder to judge.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is validated under VM0038 with a project baseline and a stated negligible leakage position in the validation report. Still, the absence of verified issuance figures, usage-rate information, and CORSIA or CCP status limits confidence that the credits are not overstated or double-counted. The project type also depends on usage behavior, so missing usage monitoring data is a meaningful weakness.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including a PDD and a validation report, and the VVB is identified as SCS Global Services.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and several key fields remain unstated or unavailable, including credit totals and monitoring details.

The record draws on at least a PDD and a validation report, and the VVB is named as SCS Global Services. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, which is positive, but the extraction confidence is only medium and several important fields are missing or unstated. The crediting period is long and the monitoring period is recent, but the documentation set still leaves important gaps in quantified performance evidence.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed activity test
Permanence	No buffer pool or reversal treatment stated
Leakage	Negligible in validation, but earlier PDD was silent
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish verified emissions reduction totals, claimed issuance totals, and the full usage monitoring method for the monitoring period.

→ Provide explicit reversal/permanence treatment and clarify CORSIA and CCP status to reduce double-claim and claim-strength uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

- Registration Representation
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Registration Review Report
- Listing Representation
- Public Commentary
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-0026BB25 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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