

QUALITY REPORT

Application of advanced hull coatings to reduce shipping fuel consumption VPA #1

GS-499 · GS · International

Report ID: CM-ACA63189 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a shipping fuel-efficiency project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated leakage treatment, but the evidence base is uneven and several key quantitative fields are missing. The project has multiple corrective requests in verification and the record contains contradictions on additionality framing, leakage wording, and crediting period, which lowers confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-499
Sector	industrial
Country	International
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Reducing Vessel Emissions Through the Use of Advanced Hull Coatings version 2
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA)
Monitoring Period	2015 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The verification report lists six corrective requests, indicating material documentation or methodology issues during validation.
- Several core items are not stated in the extracted record, including verified usage rates, baseline reassessment timing, and buffer pool coverage.
- The record contains contradictions on additionality test type, leakage treatment, and crediting period, which weakens reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the verification report, and the project uses a combined additionality approach in the PDD.

- The verification report records six corrective requests, and permanence is not well evidenced because reversal events are only noted as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is stated.

The verification report from RINA confirms additionality, which supports the project's core environmental claim. However, the report also lists six corrective requests, and permanence is weakly evidenced because reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool share is stated. The leakage treatment is favorable on paper with a 0% deduction and a negligible justification, but the record is not fully robust because some related fields are missing.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the project is tied to a named verifier, RINA Services S.p.A., in the verification report.

- Key MRV details are missing from the extracted record, including the usage monitoring method, verified usage rate, and verified ERR total.

The monitoring period is clearly identified in the verification report, and the project is associated with a named VVB, which helps traceability. Still, the extracted record does not state the usage monitoring method, verified usage rate, or verified ERR total, so the MRV trail is incomplete. The medium extraction confidence also suggests at least one source was not fully readable, limiting transparency.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ Leakage is described as negligible with a 0% deduction in the verification report.

- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which keeps dual-channel claim risk open, and the record does not provide a verified usage rate or a quantified baseline reassessment.

The project's leakage treatment is relatively conservative, with a stated negligible justification and a 0% deduction in the verification report. Even so, the project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which means dual-channel claim risk is not eliminated, and the absence of verified usage-rate data makes over-crediting harder to rule out. The baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, which is less protective than a recently reassessed jurisdictional baseline.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ The record draws on multiple document types, including the PDD, verification report, and monitoring report, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- The verification report contains six corrective requests, and the crediting period information conflicts across documents, reducing documentation reliability.

The evidence set includes several official document types, which is a positive sign for completeness. However, the verification report records six corrective requests, and the extracted record leaves several important items unstated, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and usage monitoring details. The crediting period also conflicts across documents, and I privileged the verification report's dated range because it is the more authoritative and time-specific source for the verified period, while noting the inconsistency as a reliability concern.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed test
● Permanence	No buffer pool stated
● Leakage	0% deduction with justification
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP not mentioned

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete MRV package with verified usage rates, monitoring method, and verified ERR totals for the monitoring period.

→ Resolve the document inconsistencies on additionality framing and crediting period, and disclose buffer pool coverage or other permanence safeguards.

Documents Reviewed

- GS4GG_PoA-DD_Hull coating renewal v3 06jul19 clean final 25sep19.docx
- (1)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-07-15 to 30-06-16_v4.0.docx
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_14-08-13 to 30-06-15_v6.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-07-15 to 30-06-16_v4.0.docx
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_14-08-13 to 30-06-15_v6.0.pdf
- GS Passport_22-09-15.pdf
- GS Passport_03-09-15.pdf
- PDD_22-09-15.pdf
- PDD_25-08-15.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-499
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-499
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-07-15 to 30-06-16_v2.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_14-08-13 to 30-06-15_v2.2.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_14-08-13 to 30-06-15_v2.2.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-07-15 to 30-06-16_v2.0.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-ACA63189 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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