QUALITY REPORT

Beijing Guanting Wind Power Project Phase II And Phase II Addition

VCS-830 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-A4DD8D6A · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	4.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.9
	Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths on paper, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a documented investment test, but there are meaningful concerns around leakage treatment, baseline clarity, and the large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions. The monitoring report also shows corrective actions for project start-date and meter serial-number inconsistencies, which lowers confidence in the reported results.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-830
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2009 — 2029
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	429,882 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	23 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The verified emission reductions are far below the amount claimed, with 429,882 verified versus 930,149 claimed, indicating a major over-claim risk.
- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and the project uses a project-specific baseline with no recent reassessment found.
- Corrective actions were required for an inconsistent project start date and meter serial-number issues, suggesting documentation and metering reliability problems.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the validation report.

- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the monitoring report, and no buffer pool or reversal protection is stated.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test and the VVB is named as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification), which supports the project’s core eligibility case. However, the monitoring report states leakage is not addressed, the baseline is project-specific, and no baseline reassessment date is found, all of which weaken methodological robustness. The report also lists corrective actions for an inconsistent project start date and meter serial-number issues, which further reduces confidence in the integrity of the monitoring data.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has multiple official documents available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records.

- The monitoring report shows a large discrepancy between claimed and verified reductions, and the usage monitoring method is not stated.

The project has a reasonably broad document set, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, and the extraction confidence is high. Still, the monitoring report does not state the usage monitoring method, and the verified emissions reduction figure is much lower than the claimed amount. That gap, together with the meter-related corrective actions, suggests the public record is not fully clean or easy to reconcile.

Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

+ The project is an avoidance project under VCS, which reduces permanence concerns relative to removal projects.

- The verified reductions are much lower than the claimed amount, and the leakage treatment is missing in the monitoring report.

Claim safety is weakened by the large difference between claimed and verified reductions: 930,149 claimed versus 429,882 verified in the validation/monitoring record. The monitoring report also says leakage is not addressed, while the project is not CORSIA-eligible and CCP status is not stated, so there is no strong external quality signal to offset the over-claim risk. The project is an avoidance project, which helps on permanence, but it does not resolve the over-crediting concern.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ The record includes 23 documents and the extraction confidence is high.

- Corrective actions were required for project start-date inconsistency and meter serial-number mismatches, reducing confidence in the evidence trail.

Documentation is fairly strong overall because 23 documents were used and the extraction confidence is high. The VVB is identified, the monitoring period is stated, and the project has both validation and monitoring records. However, the monitoring report required corrective actions for start-date and meter inconsistencies, which indicates some weaknesses in the underlying documentation trail.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Avoidance project with no reversal events stated
Leakage	Leakage not addressed in monitoring report
Baseline	Project-specific baseline with no reassessment date
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment in the latest monitoring documentation and reconcile it with earlier reports.

→ Publish a full reconciliation of claimed versus verified emission reductions, including meter calibration evidence and corrected serial-number records.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation

Report ID: CM-A4DD8D6A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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