QUALITY REPORT

*Zengamina Mini Hydro Scheme- Zambia

GS-1696 · GS · Zambia

Report ID: CM-50F8B1EB · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
	Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a small hydro project with some solid safeguards and a verified emissions claim, but the evidence base is incomplete on several core quality questions. Additionality was tested, leakage was treated as negligible, and the VVB reported no material findings, yet permanence, baseline reassessment, and some usage-monitoring details are not fully documented.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1696
Sector	other
Country	Zambia
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	1.D 1.0
Crediting Period	2007-07-14 — null
VVB	Gold Standard
Verified ERs	1,064 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- ■ The crediting period is inconsistent across documents: the verification report shows a start date of 2007-07-14 with no end date, while the PDD states 2008-01-01 to 2022-12-31.
- ■ Permanence and leakage controls are only partially evidenced: reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is stated.
- ■ Transparency is limited because the usage monitoring method, FNRB method, and CORSIA/CCP status are not stated in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The verification report confirms a combined additionality test and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline reassessment is only shown as 2007, and reversal events are not addressed; no buffer pool percentage is stated.

The verification report confirms a combined additionality test, and the VVB reported no material findings or corrective actions, which supports the project's core integrity. However, permanence is weakly documented because reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is provided. Baseline information is also limited: the method is project-based and the last reassessment is only shown as 2007.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2011-07-01 to 2012-12-31, and claimed and verified ERs both equal 1,064.

- Key MRV details are missing, including the usage monitoring method, FNRB method, and public eligibility status for CORSIA or CCP.

The monitoring period is clearly stated in the verification record, and the claimed and verified emissions reductions both equal 1,064, which is a positive sign for registry consistency. Still, the extracted record does not state the usage monitoring method or the FNRB method, and CORSIA eligibility is not found. These gaps limit the ability to independently assess MRV completeness.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ Leakage was treated as negligible, and the project is a small hydro scheme with a verified emissions quantity matching the claim.

- The project-specific baseline and the unresolved crediting-period contradiction reduce confidence in over-crediting risk assessment.

Claim safety is helped by the fact that leakage was deemed negligible and the verified emissions quantity matches the claimed quantity. Even so, the project uses a project-specific baseline rather than a more standardized jurisdictional approach, and the crediting-period inconsistency creates some over-crediting uncertainty. With no stated CORSIA or CCP status, dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

+ Three document types were used, including a verification report dated 2013-02-21, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- Several important fields are not stated in available documents, and the crediting-period inconsistency weakens documentation reliability.

Documentation quality is moderate because three official document types were used and the extraction confidence is medium. The verification report is relatively recent compared with the PDD, but several key fields remain unstated, including buffer pool coverage, usage monitoring method, and FNRB method. The crediting-period contradiction between the verification report and the PDD further reduces confidence in the record.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Combined test present, but VVB confirmation not explicit
Permanence	No reversal events addressed and no buffer pool stated
Leakage	Leakage deemed negligible
Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing limited
Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of the crediting period across the PDD and verification report, with the governing rationale for the final dates used.

→ Provide explicit documentation for permanence and MRV, including buffer pool treatment, reversal-risk handling, usage monitoring method, and any CORSIA/CCP eligibility status.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_monitoring period_01-07-2011to 31-12-2012.pdf
- Monitoring Report_monitoring period_01-07-2010 to 30-06-2011.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_monitoring period_14-07-2007 to 30-06-2010.pdf
- Zambia Hydro PDD _Final clean with CARS_submitted to GS VER_080825.pdf
- PDD_30-06-2007.pdf
- PDD_04-12-2007.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1696
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1696
- (1)Verification Report_monitoring period_14-07-2007 to 30-06-2010.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01-07-2011 to 31-12-2012.pdf

Report ID: CM-50F8B1EB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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