

QUALITY REPORT

Fujian Jiangle Gaotang Hydropower Project

CNN-28f9ef · Gold Standard · China

Report ID: CM-539107BB · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.7

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	1.2
■ Transparency (25%)	1.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.4
■ Documentation (15%)	1.8

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, key integrity and MRV elements (baseline approach, additionality demonstration, monitoring period, and verified ERs) are not available, making it hard to judge whether credits are robust. The only clear signals are that the registry is Gold Standard and that no material findings or corrective actions were recorded in the extracted data, but the document readability was low and the evidence set is very thin.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-28f9ef
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No baseline method, grid emission factor, or monitoring period found in the extracted record, preventing assessment of over-crediting risk for a hydropower grid-displacement project.
- No additionality test or VVB confirmation found in the extracted record.
- Verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, despite an issuance document being listed.
- Low document extraction confidence and only two documents used (one of unknown type), indicating high risk of missing or misread critical details.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.2 / 10

- Additionality and baseline approach are not found in the extracted record, so the core justification for crediting cannot be evaluated.

~ No material findings or corrective actions are shown in the extracted data, but this is not supported by a readable verification report in the evidence set.

For an avoidance hydropower project, integrity hinges on a defensible baseline (grid displacement) and a clear additionality demonstration, but neither the baseline method nor the additionality test is found in the extracted record. Leakage treatment is also not found (no leakage justification or deduction), and there is no information on baseline reassessment timing. While the extracted data shows no material findings and no corrective actions, the evidence set does not include a readable verification/monitoring narrative to rely on, and extraction confidence is low.

Transparency — 1.6 / 10

- VVB name, monitoring period, and verified ER totals are not found in the extracted record, limiting traceability and MRV transparency.

~ Registry is identified as Gold Standard, but the underlying public documentation appears incomplete in the extracted set.

The extracted record does not provide the VVB name, monitoring period, or any claimed versus verified ER totals, which prevents basic cross-checking of MRV outcomes. The evidence list includes an issuance document and an unknown document type, but key metadata such as document date and project name are not found in the extracted record. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the public record has been accurately captured.

Claim Safety — 2.4 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, increasing the risk of ambiguous marketing/claims.

- Baseline and leakage treatment are not found in the extracted record, elevating over-crediting and greenwashing risk for avoidance credits.

Because the baseline method, grid emission factor, and verified ER totals are not found in the extracted record, there is a high risk that any public claims could overstate climate impact without the ability to independently validate calculations. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not found, so buyers cannot easily understand how the credits should be marketed or whether additional claim constraints apply. Leakage treatment is not documented in the extracted record, adding uncertainty around net climate benefit claims.

Documentation — 1.8 / 10

- Minimum extraction confidence is low and only two documents were used, one of which is of unknown type/date.

- Key document metadata (document date, project name, methodology/version) are not found in the extracted record.

Documentation quality is weak: only two documents were used (issuance and an unknown document), the document date is not found, and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable. Critical fields typically present in Gold Standard documentation (methodology/version, crediting period, monitoring period, VVB identity) are not found in the extracted record. The absence of these basics materially limits auditability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced in extracted record
● Permanence	Avoidance type, but no reversal/buffer info found
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced in extracted record
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance/safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the Gold Standard PDD and the latest monitoring/verification report(s) with readable text, including the baseline method, grid emission factor source/year, additionality demonstration, and monitoring period.

→ Publish or extract registry issuance details showing claimed and verified ER totals, VVB identity, and any findings/corrective actions, plus explicit safeguards (FPIC, grievance mechanism) and CORSIA/CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1601
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1601

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-539107BB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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