QUALITY REPORT

Hebei Chongli County Qingsanying Second Phase 49.3MW Wind Power Project

VCS-807 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-41DA24FD · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
5.7 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.1
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS wind project has VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings, which supports basic credibility. However, key baseline and leakage details are missing or inconsistent across documents, and there is a major discrepancy in verified ERs that increases over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-807
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	48,321 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- ■ Large contradiction in verified emission reductions between two validation reports (48,321 vs 541,324), creating significant reliability/over-crediting risk.
- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the monitoring report says leakage is not addressed, while the validation report says leakage was quantified.
- ■ Crediting period start date is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2019 vs 2009), raising concerns about project timeline clarity.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation report, 2022-12-16).

- Baseline and leakage robustness are weakened by missing reassessment timing and conflicting leakage treatment (monitoring report, 2022-12-15; validation report, 2022-12-16).

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation report (2022-12-16) confirms an investment test and VVB confirmation is indicated. Baseline setting is project-specific (ACM0002 v20.0) and the extracted record does not show when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens robustness. Leakage is a key weakness: the monitoring report (2022-12-15) indicates leakage was not addressed, while the validation report (2022-12-16) indicates leakage was quantified, creating uncertainty about whether any deduction was applied. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, which is positive for procedural integrity (monitoring/verification record).

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated (2021-12-01 to 2022-05-31) and the VVB is identified (monitoring report, 2022-12-15).

- Core quantification inputs and outputs are incomplete/unclear in the extracted record (e.g., grid emission factor not found; total ERs claimed not found) and ER totals conflict across documents.

The monitoring report (2022-12-15) clearly states the monitoring period (2021-12-01 to 2022-05-31) and identifies the VVB as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification). However, key calculation inputs such as the grid emission factor and its reference year were not found in the extracted record, limiting reproducibility. The extracted record also lacks the total ERs claimed, and the verified ER figure is inconsistent across validation reports, reducing confidence in public MRV clarity.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing one channel of downstream claim risk (registry/eligibility record).

- Over-crediting risk is elevated due to the large contradiction in verified ERs and unclear leakage handling (validation reports, 2022-10-17 vs 2022-12-16; monitoring report, 2022-12-15).

CORSIA eligibility is explicitly false, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation claims based on these credits. Nonetheless, the contradiction in verified ERs (48,321 in the 2022-12-16 validation report versus 541,324 in the 2022-10-17 validation report) is large enough to materially affect buyer claims and suggests a heightened risk of misstatement or document/version confusion. Unclear leakage treatment (monitoring report says not addressed; validation report says quantified) further increases the risk that credited reductions could be overstated.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Multiple document types were available and extraction confidence is high (10 documents; validation, monitoring, issuance).

- Several social/safeguards fields conflict between monitoring and issuance records, indicating internal inconsistency (monitoring report, 2022-08-18/2022-12-15 vs issuance, 2022-11-13).

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: multiple document types are present (validation, monitoring, issuance) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, suggesting the underlying files were readable. Still, internal consistency is an issue: issuance (2022-11-13) conflicts with monitoring reports on whether safeguards were mentioned, whether FPIC was conducted, and whether benefit sharing was described (monitoring report, 2022-08-18/2022-12-15). The crediting period start date also conflicts between monitoring reports (2009 vs 2019), indicating version control or reporting errors that reduce documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No reversal risk indicated for wind; no reversals reported
Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent across documents
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not shown
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/benefit sharing inconsistently recorded
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/clarify the final verified ER total for the monitoring period and explain the 48,321 vs 541,324 discrepancy with a document version history or VVB clarification letter.

→ Provide a clear leakage assessment consistent across validation and monitoring (including whether a leakage deduction was applied and the quantified value, if any), and disclose the grid emission factor and reference year used for calculations.

Documents Reviewed

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

Report ID: CM-41DA24FD · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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