

QUALITY REPORT

CECIC HKC Danjinghe Wind Farm Project

GS-1815 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-F9FC729E · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.0

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	3.6
■ Transparency (25%)	4.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a standard wind project with a project baseline and some safeguards in place, but the extracted record leaves major gaps on additionality, leakage treatment, and monitoring details. The documentation also shows a crediting-period contradiction between two PDD versions, which reduces confidence in the record and keeps the score in the lower-middle range.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1815
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 19.0
Crediting Period	2015 — 2022
VVB	China Classification Society Certification Company
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Additionality is not confirmed in the extracted record, and no test type or VVB confirmation is stated.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed, with no quantified deduction or justification found.
- The crediting period differs between two PDD versions, and I privileged the later PDD dated 2019-10-31 because it is more recent, but the inconsistency still weakens reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.6 / 10

- + The project uses a project-specific baseline under ACM0002, and the baseline was last reassessed in 2015.
- Additionality is not documented in the extracted facts, leakage is not addressed, and reversal risk is not discussed.

The project has a project baseline under ACM0002, and the baseline was last reassessed in 2015, which supports some methodological structure. However, additionality is not stated in the extracted record, the leakage justification is explicitly marked as not addressed, and reversal events are also not addressed, so the integrity case is only moderate.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

- + The VVB is named as China Classification Society Certification Company, and the record shows some validation findings were raised and then closed.
- Monitoring-period details, claimed versus verified emission reductions, and usage-monitoring information are not stated in available documents.

The verification body is identified as China Classification Society Certification Company, and the validation findings were reportedly closed, which helps. But the monitoring period is not found, and the extracted record does not provide claimed or verified emission reduction totals, usage monitoring, or other registry-level detail needed for strong transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

- + The project is a wind renewable-energy activity under Gold Standard, which is generally lower risk than many land-use credit types.
- The baseline and leakage treatment are only partially documented, and there is no evidence here on CORSIA or CCP status to reduce dual-claim concern.

As a wind project, the underlying activity is relatively low risk for over-crediting compared with many other project types. Even so, the claim-safety assessment is weakened by the project-specific baseline, missing leakage treatment, and the absence of any stated CORSIA or CCP status in the extracted facts.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

- + The record includes a PDD, a named VVB, and a stated crediting period, with six extracted documents used.
- One key document appears to have been difficult to read only at medium confidence, and the crediting-period contradiction between PDD versions reduces documentation reliability.

The record includes a PDD and indicates six documents were used, with a named VVB and a stated crediting period. Still, extraction confidence is only medium, and the contradictory crediting-period dates between two PDD versions reduce confidence; I privileged the later PDD dated 2019-10-31 because it is more recent, but the inconsistency remains a documentation weakness.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No VVB-confirmed additionality found
● Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessed in 2015
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the validation or verification evidence showing the additionality test used and the VVB conclusion on additionality.

→ Disclose the monitoring report with verified emission reductions, leakage treatment, and a clear explanation of the crediting-period discrepancy.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)EC09(A)2018002-CECIC_HKC_Danjinghe_Wind_Farm_Project--clean.pdf
- Dangjinghe-SCR_1203_clean_version[1].doc
- PDD_2.0-danjinghe-JL_1203clean_version.docx
- PDD_3-danjinghe-JL 191031 Clean.docx
- danjinghe_pdd.pdf
- PDD_2.1-danjinghe-JL 190510[1].docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1815
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1815

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-F9FC729E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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