

QUALITY REPORT

*Project White Hill

GS-1695 · Gold Standard · New Zealand

Report ID: CM-50F6C380 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a reasonably credible wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings in the verification report. However, the record is thin on baseline reassessment, leakage treatment, and crediting-period detail, which limits confidence in the claim quality and documentation completeness.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1695
Sector	other
Country	New Zealand
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 01
VVB	DNV CERTIFICATION PTY LTD
Monitoring Period	2007 — 2007
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is not stated in the available documents, even though it should be straightforward to document for a wind project.
- The record does not state whether the project is CORSIA-eligible, and CCP status is only noted as not mentioned, leaving dual-claim risk unclear.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ The verification report from DNV CERTIFICATION PTY LTD confirms additionality, and no material findings or corrective actions were reported.

- The baseline is described only as project-based, with no reassessment date, leakage deduction, or buffer arrangement stated in the extracted record.

The verification report by DNV CERTIFICATION PTY LTD confirms additionality, which supports the core integrity case. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, and there are no reversal events in the extracted record. That said, the baseline is only described as project-based, with no reassessment date, no leakage deduction, and no buffer pool information, so the robustness of the accounting is only moderate.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period from 2007-01-01 to 2007-12-31, and the verification report is dated 2008-09-16.

- Total verified emissions reductions, total claimed reductions, and key MRV details such as usage monitoring and grid factor inputs are not found in the available documents.

Transparency is limited by missing MRV outputs and incomplete quantitative disclosure. The monitoring period is stated as 2007-01-01 to 2007-12-31 and the verification report is dated 2008-09-16, but total verified emissions reductions, total claimed reductions, usage monitoring method, and grid emission factor inputs are not found in the extracted record. The presence of a named verifier helps, but the public-facing completeness appears partial.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ Wind projects generally have lower permanence risk, and the record shows no reversal events.

- The project-specific baseline and missing leakage treatment reduce confidence that the credited reductions are fully robust.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is a wind project with no reversal events reported, which lowers permanence concerns. However, the baseline remains project-based rather than clearly standardized or recently reassessed, and leakage treatment is not stated. CORSIA eligibility is not stated and CCP status is only noted as not mentioned, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ The evidence set includes a PDD and a verification report, with four documents used and medium extraction confidence.

- The crediting period is not stated, baseline reassessment is missing, and several core quantitative fields are absent from the extracted record.

The documentation set is somewhat limited but not absent: the extracted record shows a PDD and a verification report, with four documents used overall. Medium extraction confidence suggests the documents were readable enough for partial extraction, but several key fields remain missing, including the crediting period and baseline reassessment timing. The absence of corrective actions is positive, yet the overall record is incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Wind project; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage not stated
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish the full monitoring and verification data, including verified emissions reductions, baseline inputs, and any leakage treatment.
- State the crediting period, baseline reassessment history, and explicit CORSIA/CCP status to reduce double-claim and documentation uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

- GS-PDD WhiteHill_58MW Dec05.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1695
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1695
- White Hill VER 2007 DNV verification (2).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-50F6C380 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy