

QUALITY REPORT

Grouped Commercial Electric Vehicles Project of Intelligent Link

VCS-4335 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-80882985 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	2.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.5
	■ Documentation (15%)	2.0

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

Assessment Summary

Evidence scope is marketplace_only: only high-level listing metadata is provided (VCS, AMS-III.C, China, registration date, estimated ERs) with no public PDD, monitoring, or verification documents to substantiate claims. Scores are therefore conservative and low-confidence, with the main limitation being inability to assess additionality, baseline grid factor, and EV usage/charging data quality.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-4335
Sector	other
Country	China
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS-III.C. 16.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2031
VVB	CTI
Verified ERs	25,105 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.0 / 10

~ Transport electrification can be credible, but additionality and baseline depend on audited grid EF and ICE counterfactual; not evidenced here

- No public MRV to assess leakage/rebound, charging source, or activity data quality

Based on marketplace metadata only, the project is a grouped commercial EV activity under AMS-III.C with estimated reductions of 88,354 tCO₂e/yr, but there is no accessible PDD, monitoring report, or verification report to evaluate additionality or baseline assumptions. For transport electrification in China, additionality can be mixed due to strong policy support and market momentum; without an audited investment/barrier analysis, additionality remains uncertain. Baseline integrity depends heavily on the grid emission factor, vehicle activity data, and how the baseline (ICE vehicles) is defined—none of which are evidenced here. Permanence is generally not a major risk for transport projects, but leakage/rebound (e.g., shifting ICE use elsewhere) cannot be assessed without monitoring details.

Transparency — 2.0 / 10

- No linked registry page or downloadable project documents provided

~ Only basic metadata available (VCS, AMS-III.C, China, registration date, estimated ERs)

No registry link, project page, or downloadable documents (PDD, monitoring, verification) were provided, so the audit trail cannot be independently checked. While the listing states VCS and a registration date (2024-02-29), we cannot confirm issuance/retirement records or whether documents are publicly posted on the registry. As a result, transparency is scored low.

Claim Safety — 4.5 / 10

~ Recent registration date (2024-02-29) supports recency, but issuance/retirement cannot be confirmed

- Double-claim/ownership controls and claim guidance cannot be validated without registry serials and retirement records

With only marketplace metadata, a buyer faces elevated greenwashing/double-claim risk because we cannot verify serial numbers, issuance status, or retirement rules on the registry. The registration date is recent (2024), which is directionally positive for vintage relevance, but there is no evidence of CCP eligibility, corresponding adjustment/Article 6 authorization, or clear claim guidance. Overall, claims should be limited to 'supporting a VCS-registered project' until registry issuance and retirement can be verified.

Documentation — 2.0 / 10

- No public PDD, monitoring report, or verification report available

- Cannot check methodology parameterization (grid EF vintage, baseline vehicle definition, sampling/QA procedures)

No PDD, monitoring report, or third-party verification report is available in the provided materials. Without these, key MRV elements for AMS-III.C (activity data, baseline vehicle definition, grid EF, charging source, sampling/QA) cannot be reviewed. Documentation is therefore very weak.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Unresolved risk (no public additionality assessment/verifica
● Permanence	Low inherent reversal risk for transport emission reductions
● Leakage	Not assessable without monitoring details (possible rebound/
● Baseline	Not assessable without baseline vehicle definition and grid
● Safeguards	No public information on stakeholder engagement or safeguard
● Double-claim	Cannot verify issuance/serials/retirement on registry from m

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the official Verra registry link plus public downloads of the PDD (incl. additionality and baseline definition) and any registration/validation documentation

→ Publish the first monitoring report and third-party verification report showing audited activity data (vehicle km, electricity consumed), grid emission factor source/vintage, and QA/QC procedures

→ Disclose issuance and retirement records (serial ranges, vintages, retirement beneficiary) to substantiate buyer claim safety

Documents Reviewed

- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- 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-80882985 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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