

QUALITY REPORT

*Te Apiti Wind Farm

GS-1668 · Gold Standard · New Zealand

Report ID: CM-548A4545 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.7
	■ Transparency (25%)	3.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	3.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings, which supports integrity. However, the record is thin, the extraction confidence is low, and several key MRV and registry details are not stated, which weakens transparency and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1668
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	New Zealand
Vintage	Recent
Crediting Period	2008 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed, with no quantified deduction or justification found in the available record.
- The project has low extraction confidence and missing monitoring/registry details, limiting confidence in the claims.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.7 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB in the project document.
- Leakage treatment is not addressed, and reversal risk is not clearly managed beyond the project being a wind farm.

The project document states that additionality was assessed with an investment test and that the VVB confirmed it, which is a meaningful positive for integrity. The same document reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. On the negative side, leakage is marked as not addressed and no leakage deduction is provided, so the integrity score is held back.

Transparency — 3.4 / 10

- + The project document identifies the project, crediting period, and baseline approach, giving some core project context.
- Key MRV details such as the monitoring period, verifier name, and verified emissions figures are not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record does not state the verifier name, monitoring period, or verified emissions totals. The project design document does provide the project identity, crediting period, and a project baseline approach, but the overall MRV picture remains incomplete. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence in the documentation trail.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

- + The project is a renewable-energy wind project, which generally lowers over-crediting risk compared with more complex land-use projects.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed jurisdictional baseline, and leakage is not addressed.

Claim safety is moderate because this is a wind project, which is generally lower risk than many other credit types, and the project has VVB-confirmed additionality. Still, the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, leakage is not addressed, and there is no evidence in the extracted record for usage monitoring or other safeguards that would reduce over-crediting risk. With no CORSIA or CCP status stated, channel-risk clarity is also limited.

Documentation — 3.1 / 10

- + The record includes a project design document and shows no material findings or corrective actions required.
- Extraction confidence is low, and only limited document coverage is visible in the extracted record.

The available evidence appears to come mainly from a project design document, with four documents used in extraction, but the record is sparse. The extraction confidence is low, which suggests at least one key source was difficult to read. Although no material findings or corrective actions were reported, the missing monitoring and registry details keep the documentation score low.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer status not stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present, but partial detail
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verification report and monitoring report with verified emissions totals, monitoring period, and verifier identity.

→ Document leakage treatment, buffer or reversal safeguards, and registry/channel status to clarify claim safety.

Documents Reviewed

- PDD_20-08-2003.pdf
- PDD_20-08-2003 (2).pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1668
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1668

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-548A4545 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy