

QUALITY REPORT

Everbright Zhenjiang Bundled Solar PV Power Generation Project_preCDM VER

GS-1315 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-4A542958 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.1Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	3.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a small solar electricity project with a project-specific baseline and no material findings reported by the verifier, but the record leaves important gaps on additionality, permanence, and safeguards. The leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, and several key items needed to judge credit quality are not stated in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1315
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	2011 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Additionality is not confirmed in the extracted verification record, so the robustness of the emissions claim is unclear.
- The leakage justification is contradictory: the verification report says it was not addressed, while the monitoring report is described as quantified.
- Safeguards, grievance handling, and buffer pool coverage are not stated in the available documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

- + The verifier reported no material findings and no corrective actions were required in the verification report.
- Additionality was not confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, and permanence protections such as a buffer pool are not stated.

The project is a solar electricity activity under AMS-I.D with a project-specific baseline, and the verification report from TÜV NORD reports no material findings and no corrective actions. However, additionality is not confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and reversal risk is not addressed, which weakens the integrity assessment.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The project has both a monitoring report and a verification report, with a named verifier and a defined monitoring period from 2011-08-27 to 2012-03-31.
- Claimed versus verified emission reductions are not stated, and key MRV details such as usage monitoring and baseline reassessment are missing.

The documentation includes both a monitoring report and a verification report, and the monitoring period is clearly stated as 2011-08-27 to 2012-03-31. Even so, the extracted record does not state claimed or verified emission reductions, usage monitoring details, or a baseline reassessment date, so transparency is only moderate.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

- + The project uses a project-specific baseline under AMS-I.D, which at least identifies the baseline approach.
- Leakage treatment is unclear because the verification report says it was not addressed, while the contradiction notes a quantified value in the monitoring report.

Claim safety is constrained by missing or inconsistent evidence on leakage and by the absence of key over-crediting checks in the extracted record. The verification report says leakage was not addressed, while the contradiction notes that the monitoring report quantified it; I privilege the verification report because it is the assurance document, but the inconsistency still lowers confidence. No CORSIA or CCP status is stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available record.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + Two official documents were used, and the extraction confidence is high.
- Several core fields are not found in the extracted record, including additionality testing, buffer pool coverage, and safeguard procedures.

Documentation quality is mixed: there are two official documents and the extraction confidence is high, which supports reliability. At the same time, several important items are not found in the extracted record, including additionality testing, buffer pool coverage, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and verified usage data, so the file is incomplete for a full quality review.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No VVB-confirmed additionality found
● Permanence	No buffer pool or reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline only
● Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned but not documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full additionality demonstration and VVB confirmation, including the underlying test and evidence.

→ Disclose verified emission reductions, leakage treatment, buffer or reversal provisions, and explicit safeguard documentation such as FPIC and grievance procedures.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_27-08-11 to 31-03-12_v2.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_27-08-11 to 31-03-12_v2.0.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1315
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1315
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_27-08-11 to 31-03-12_v1.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_27-08-11 to 31-03-12_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-4A542958 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy