QUALITY REPORT

# Sapphire 49.5 MW Wind Farm Project

GS-3328 · GS · Pakistan

Report ID: CM-229298C2 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.7**
Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|---|---|
| **Integrity (35%)** | 4.0 |
| **Transparency (25%)** | 6.0 |
| **Claim Safety (25%)** | 4.0 |
| **Documentation (15%)** | 5.5 |

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some procedural strengths (VVB-reviewed additionality, named VVB, FPIC and grievance mechanism), but material reliability gaps reduce confidence: contradictory verified emission reduction figures, missing leakage justification despite a reported 0% deduction, and incomplete baseline reassessment data. Overall quality is moderate but several data gaps raise risk of over-crediting.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| **Registry** | Gold Standard |
| **Registry ID** | GS-3328 |
| **Sector** | renewable_energy |
| **Country** | Pakistan |
| **Vintage** | 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 |
| **Project Methodology** | ACM0002 20.0 |
| **Crediting Period** | 2019 — 2024 |
| **VVB** | LGAI Technological Center, S.A. |
| **Verified ERs** | 111,455 $tCO_2e$ |
| **Monitoring Period** | 2021 — 2022 |
| **Confidence** | High |
| **Documents Reviewed** | 20 documents reviewed |
| **Scored** | 2026-04-23 |

## Red Flags

- Contradictory total emission reductions reported (52,737 vs 111,455 $tCO_2e$)
- Leakage not adequately justified in the most recent monitoring report despite a 0% leakage deduction

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.0 / 10

+ additionality confirmed by the VVB (verification report cited)

- leakage not addressed in the latest monitoring report and buffer percentage not stated

Additionality was confirmed by the VVB according to the verification material, which is a positive sign. However, the project uses a project-level baseline under ACM0002 and the baseline reassessment date is not stated in available documents, reducing robustness. Leakage treatment is weak: the monitoring report lists a 0% leakage deduction but the latest monitoring report states leakage justification is not addressed; buffer pool percentage is not provided. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, and no reversal events are recorded in the extracted records.

### Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ VVB named (LGAI Technological Center, S.A.) and monitoring period provided (2021–01–01 to 2022–12–31)

~ contradictory verified emission reduction figures across documents (52,737 vs 111,455), lowering data reliability

The VVB is named (LGAI Technological Center, S.A.) and the monitoring period is stated (2021-01-01 to 2022-12-31), which supports transparency. However, there are clear contradictions in total verified emissions reductions (52,737 vs 111,455) across documents and the minimum extraction confidence is only medium, which lowers confidence in reported figures and the consistency of public disclosure. Key inputs such as grid emission factor and final non-renewable biomass values are not found in the extracted record.

### Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

- project-level baseline (ACM0002, project baseline) which increases over-crediting risk compared with jurisdictional baselines

~ key double-claim indicators not stated (CORSIA/CCP status unknown) and conflicting ERR figures

Risk of over-crediting is elevated: the project relies on a project-specific baseline (ACM0002) and there are inconsistent ERR numbers that suggest reporting or calculation discrepancies. Leakage justification is inconsistent across reports (one report says quantified; the later report says not addressed) while the applied leakage deduction is 0%, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk. CORSIA and CCP statuses are not stated, so double-claim risk cannot be ruled out.

### Documentation — 5.5 / 10

+ multiple documents listed (PDD and monitoring reports) and 14 documents extracted

~ minimum extraction confidence is medium and there are explicit contradictions in core metrics

Documentation is mixed: 14 documents were used and core documents (PDD, monitoring reports) are present. The most recent monitoring report is dated 2022-09-01. Extraction confidence is medium, and an 'unknown' evidence document and several contradictions indicate gaps. No corrective actions or material findings are listed in the extracted verification record.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| **Additionality** | VVB-confirmed |
| **Permanence** | buffer unclear |
| **Leakage** | not addressed |
| **Baseline** | project baseline |
| **Safeguards** | FPIC & grievance present |
| **Double-claim** | CORSIA/CCP status unknown |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Reconcile and publicly document the verified emission reduction figures with an updated verification statement (clarify 52,737 vs 111,455 $tCO_2e$)

→ Provide a clear leakage assessment and justification (or a quantified leakage deduction) and disclose buffer pool percentage or reversal risk treatment

## Documents Reviewed

- 20220415 EF and ER calculation sheet_MP20190802-20201231_clean.xlsx
- 231218_GS_Annual_Monitoring_Report.pdf
- GS11307_20240307 GS MR Sapphire 2023 1.6 (clean).pdf
- GS11307 EF and ER calculation sheet_v2.xlsx
- 251230 GS Annual Report.pdf
- 20211008 PA8163 CDM MR 20180101to20201231_clean.pdf
- 241220 GS Annual Report.pdf
- 20220901 GS MR Sapphire 2nd MP-v2.1-clean.pdf
- 20221229 Project-Annual-Report-Form-final.pdf
- GS11307 2023 sheet EF and ER calculation sheet 1.3.xlsx
- DEV_574(1).pdf
- 20211008 GS11307_GS SCR.pdf
- 20220317_GS4GG Final VAL Report_Sapphire Wind-clean.pdf
- Sapphire - Transition-request-form -v1.docx
- 20220317_GS11307_GS PDD_v3.2_clean.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3328
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3328
- 2024_03_28_FVR_Sapphire_TR_PR_RM1 - Clean.pdf
- 20211027_FVerR_Sapphire Wind_2nd CDM VER_clean.pdf
- Updated 20220905_GS-FVerR-Sapphire Wind 1st_V02-clean.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-229298C2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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