QUALITY REPORT

Hebei Chengde Weichang Yudaokou Pasture 150MW Wind Farm Project

VCS-892 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-3962FC36 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS wind project shows moderate integrity: additionality is confirmed by the VVB and the claimed and verified emission reductions match for the latest monitoring period. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (grid emission factor, credited ER totals, crediting period, and safeguards disclosures) reduce confidence and increase perceived over-crediting and reputational risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-892
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2020 — 2030
VVB	CTI Certification Co., Ltd (CTI)
Verified ERs	273,055 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	49 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Conflicting verified emission reduction totals across validation reports (273,055 vs 136,337), creating uncertainty about what was actually verified/issued.
- Grid emission factor differs materially between validation reports (0.8269 vs 1.05485), which can significantly change credited reductions.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent: earlier validation indicates leakage was quantified, while the 2023 monitoring record shows leakage not addressed despite a 0% deduction.
- Safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are reported as present in 2023 but absent in a 2016 monitoring report, suggesting evolving or inconsistently documented stakeholder processes.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The monitoring record (2023-08-31) shows the claimed and verified emission reductions are identical at 273,055 tCO2e for 2021-12-01 to 2022-05-31, and no material findings were reported.

- Baseline and key quantification inputs show inconsistencies across documents (notably the grid emission factor and leakage treatment), weakening confidence in baseline validity and ER quantification.

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation/verification process confirms an investment test, and the monitoring record (2023-08-31) reports no material findings. The baseline is project-specific under ACM0002, but the extracted record does not state when the baseline was last reassessed, which is an evidence gap for baseline robustness. Integrity is further weakened by inconsistent quantification inputs across validation reports (notably the grid emission factor) and inconsistent leakage treatment between the validation report (2016-05-20) and the monitoring record (2023-08-31).

Transparency — 6.6 / 10

+ The project identifies the VVB (CTI) and provides a clearly defined monitoring period (2021-12-01 — 2022-05-31) with matching claimed vs verified totals in the 2023 monitoring record.

- Corrective actions in the monitoring record (2023-08-31) indicate reporting gaps and monitoring-plan compliance clarifications were required (including the 10kV backup line).

The monitoring record (2023-08-31) provides a clear monitoring period (2021-12-01 — 2022-05-31) and shows the same total for claimed and verified emission reductions (273,055 tCO2e), which supports MRV clarity for that period. However, the same monitoring record lists corrective actions, including adding a comparison table of estimated vs achieved reductions and clarifying compliance with the registered monitoring plan regarding a 10kV backup line. These issues reduce transparency because they indicate the reporting package was incomplete or required clarification during review.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting/greenwashing risk is elevated by contradictory grid emission factors and conflicting verified ER totals across validation reports.

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, which lowers the risk of high-profile aviation claims. Nonetheless, claim safety is constrained by over-crediting risk signals: validation reports disagree on the grid emission factor (0.8269 vs 1.05485) and on the verified ER total (273,055 vs 136,337), both of which can materially affect credited outcomes. Leakage is also problematic: the monitoring record (2023-08-31) shows a 0% leakage deduction while stating leakage was not addressed, conflicting with the validation report (2016-05-20) that indicates leakage was quantified.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 41 documents used.

- Multiple contradictions across official documents (safeguards, crediting period, ER totals, grid EF) indicate record-management and consistency issues.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the extracted record references a PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance, with 41 documents used and high extraction confidence. However, the presence of multiple contradictions across documents (safeguards and stakeholder process disclosures, crediting period dates, grid emission factor values, and verified ER totals) indicates inconsistent documentation over time. Corrective actions in the monitoring record (2023-08-31) also suggest the submitted documentation required supplementation and clarification.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Investment test confirmed by VVB
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
Leakage	0% deduction but justification inconsistent/missing
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	Safeguards reported but inconsistent across years
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled quantification note that explains changes across validation reports (grid emission factor choice, data sources/years, and why verified ER totals differ), and align all documents to a single authoritative set of parameters.

→ Provide a consistent, auditable safeguards package (FPIC evidence, grievance procedure records, and benefit-sharing documentation) and explain why earlier monitoring documentation reported these as absent.

Documents Reviewed

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

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-3962FC36 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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