


QUALITY REPORT

*Huadian Ningxia Ningdong Yangjiayao 45MW Wind-farm Project preCDM VERs

GS-1085 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-BA93F9FB · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This is a reasonably documented wind project with VVB-verified additionality, a named verifier, and no material findings reported. However, the record has some reliability gaps: leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, several key MRV fields are not stated, and the project uses a project-specific baseline rather than a recently reassessed standardized one.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1085
Sector	other
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 version 6
Crediting Period	2008 — 2015
VVB	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Verified ERs	22,823 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2007 — 2008
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the verification report says leakage was quantified, while the monitoring report says it was deemed negligible.
- Several important MRV and market-claim fields are not stated, including the grid emission factor, usage monitoring details, and CCP status.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and the VVB confirmed it in the verification report.

- Leakage treatment is not fully consistent across documents, and reversal risk is not addressed beyond a statement that the methodology does not require leakage consideration.

The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test and says the VVB accepted it, which supports the project's core crediting case. No material findings were reported, but the report still required corrective actions on meter location and data transfer wording, which weakens confidence in MRV rigor. Leakage handling is not fully clean: the verification report describes leakage as quantified, while the monitoring report says it was deemed negligible, and the project also uses a project-specific baseline rather than a recently reassessed standardized one.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier, TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH, and the monitoring period is clearly stated in the verification report.

- Key public-MRV details are missing or not stated, including the grid emission factor, usage monitoring method, and total claimed ERs.

The documentation identifies TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH as the verifier and gives a clear monitoring period from 2007-12-14 to 2008-05-31. However, several important fields are not stated in the available documents, including the grid emission factor, usage monitoring method, and the amount of ERs claimed. That leaves the public record incomplete even though the project file itself is not sparse.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is a wind farm under ACM0002, which is generally a lower-risk mitigation type than many industrial crediting activities.

- The project-specific baseline and the leakage inconsistency reduce confidence in over-crediting risk controls, and CORSIA eligibility is marked true without CCP status being stated.

A wind project under ACM0002 is generally less exposed to reversal and leakage concerns than land-use projects, which helps claim safety. Still, the project-specific baseline and the contradictory leakage treatment reduce confidence that credit volumes are tightly bounded. CORSIA eligibility is marked true, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

+ Three evidence documents were used, including a verification report, PDD, and monitoring report.

- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report still lists corrective actions about unclear meter location and data transfer wording.

The record draws on three documents, which is a decent documentary base, and the project dates and verifier are clearly identified. Even so, extraction confidence is only medium, suggesting at least one source was not fully readable. The verification report's corrective actions also show that some monitoring details were not presented cleanly enough for a fully robust file.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	no buffer pool stated
● Leakage	leakage treatment inconsistent
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled leakage assessment across the verification and monitoring reports, with a clear explanation of why one treatment is correct.

→ Publish the missing MRV and market-claim details, especially the grid emission factor, usage monitoring method, and CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_14-12-07 to 31-05-08_v2.0.pdf
- PDD_22-05-08.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1085
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1085
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_14-12-07 to 31-05-08_v2.0.pdf

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-BA93F9FB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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