

QUALITY REPORT

# Everbright Suqian & Huaining Bundled Solar PV Power Generation Project

GS-1270 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-701DB5DB · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>4.1</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>3.8</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.2</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.6</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>4.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a renewable electricity project with a verified report from TÜV NORD and no material findings, but the extracted record leaves several core quality questions unresolved. Additionality is not clearly documented, leakage is marked as not addressed despite a zero deduction, and permanence-related information is incomplete, so the project should be treated cautiously.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1270
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 17.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2019
VVB	TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- Additionality is not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and the verification report does not show a stated test or VVB-confirmed additionality.
- Leakage is listed as not addressed even though a 0% deduction was applied, which weakens confidence in the treatment of project emissions accounting.
- No buffer pool, reversal handling, or usage monitoring details were found in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 3.8 / 10

- + The verification report from TÜV NORD reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.
- Additionality is not stated in the available extraction, and leakage treatment is marked as not addressed despite a zero deduction.

The verification report dated 2013-09-13 from TÜV NORD states no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports basic project credibility. However, the extracted record does not state the additionality test type or confirm additionality by the VVB, and leakage is marked as not addressed even though a 0% deduction is shown. Baseline reassessment is only noted for 2012, so the overall integrity case is moderate rather than strong.

### Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The monitoring period and crediting period are both stated, and the project has a named verifier and a dated verification report.
- Key MRV fields such as total ERR claimed versus verified, usage monitoring method, and FNRB information are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited by missing MRV detail in the extracted record. The monitoring period and crediting period are stated, and the verifier is named, but total ERR claimed versus verified, usage monitoring method, and FNRB information are not found. The medium extraction confidence helps, but the record still lacks enough public-facing detail to score highly.

### Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline under AMS-I.D and reports a grid emission factor, which is at least directionally consistent with a renewable electricity claim.
- Leakage justification is not addressed, and CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, leaving residual claim-risk uncertainty.

Claim safety is weakened by unresolved accounting and eligibility questions. The project uses a project baseline under AMS-I.D and reports a grid emission factor of 0.81415, but leakage justification is not addressed and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status. Because the extracted facts do not show over-crediting controls such as verified usage rates or a clearly documented leakage rationale, the claim should be treated conservatively.

### Documentation — 4.1 / 10

- + Four documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- The extracted record is incomplete on several important fields, including buffer pool treatment, reversal handling, and additionality evidence.

Documentation quality is middling: four documents were used, the extraction confidence is medium, and the verification report is dated and identifiable. At the same time, several important fields are missing from the extracted record, including buffer pool treatment, reversal handling, and additionality evidence. The absence of corrective actions is positive, but the overall documentation set is incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	additionality not clearly evidenced
● <b>Permanence</b>	reversal treatment not documented
● <b>Leakage</b>	0% deduction but justification missing
● <b>Baseline</b>	project baseline, reassessment timing limited
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the underlying additionality assessment and any VVB confirmation, including the exact test used and supporting evidence.

→ Disclose leakage rationale, reversal/buffer treatment, and the project's CORSIA and CCP status with complete MRV figures.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_01-04-12 to 31-03-13\_v2.0.pdf
- GS Passport\_27-08-13.pdf
- PDD\_27-05-13.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1270
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1270
- Verification Report\_1st monitoring period\_01-04-12 to 31-03-13\_v1.0.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-701DB5DB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)