

QUALITY REPORT

*Fujian Zhangpu Liuaio 45MW Wind Power Project

GS-658 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-1371F883 · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.1
■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a standard wind project with a VVB verification, an investment-test additionality case, and no reported reversal events during the monitoring period. However, several key items are either not stated or inconsistently documented, including leakage treatment, baseline reassessment timing, and the project’s crediting-period dates across documents, which weakens confidence in the record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-658
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 06
Crediting Period	2008 — 2015
VVB	SGS United Kingdom Ltd
Verified ERs	71,812 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the verification record says leakage was not addressed, while the monitoring report is said to quantify it.
- The crediting period differs between the verification report and the PDD, creating a documentation reliability issue.
- Material findings and corrective actions were raised in verification, indicating the project was not fully clean at review.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.1 / 10

+ The verification report from SGS United Kingdom Ltd confirms an investment-test additionality approach and no reversal events during the monitoring period.

- Leakage is not clearly resolved in the verification record, and the baseline was last reassessed in 2007, which is dated.

The project uses ACM0002 with an investment-test additionality case, and the verification report by SGS United Kingdom Ltd reports no reversal events during the monitoring period. That said, the baseline was last reassessed in 2007, which is old, and leakage is not clearly settled in the verification record. The presence of multiple CARs and FARs also suggests the project needed substantive follow-up before the verification could be finalized.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a verified emissions result of 71,812 credits in the verification report.

- Key MRV details are missing or not stated in available documents, including the usage monitoring method and several emissions-input fields.

The documentation includes a named verifier, a clear monitoring period from 2011-05-28 to 2012-05-27, and a verified emissions quantity of 71,812. However, several MRV fields are not stated in available documents, including the usage monitoring method and multiple grid-factor inputs. The record is therefore usable but incomplete for a full public audit trail.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is a wind project under ACM0002, which is generally lower risk than many land-use crediting activities.

- The verification report leaves leakage unresolved and the project is CCP approved, which does not eliminate over-crediting or claim-risk concerns.

As a wind project, the underlying activity is relatively low risk compared with projects that have major permanence or land-use exposure. Even so, the verification report does not clearly resolve leakage, and the project is marked CCP approved, which does not by itself remove over-crediting concerns. The absence of several quantified inputs also limits confidence in the exact claim strength.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Three core document types were available, and the verification report is dated 2013, showing reasonably recent review relative to the crediting period.

- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report lists multiple CARs and FARs with follow-up corrections required.

Three core documents were used, but the extraction confidence is only medium, so at least one source was not fully clear. The verification report contains several corrective-action items, and the record also shows a mismatch in the crediting-period dates between the verification report and the PDD. Those issues reduce confidence in the completeness and consistency of the documentation set.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test present, but VVB confirmation not explicit
● Permanence	Wind project with no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent across documents
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline with dated reassessment
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards are documented
● Double-claim	CCP approved; no evidence of double registration

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide a fully reconciled leakage assessment and explain the difference between the verification report and monitoring report.
- Publish a complete MRV package with all key inputs, the usage monitoring method, and a clear reconciliation of the crediting-period dates.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_5th monitoring period_28-05-11 to 27-05-12_v5.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_21-01-08 to 27-05-08_v4.0.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_28-05-10 to 27-05-11_v2.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_28-05-08 to 27-05-09_v2.0.pdf
- PDD_12-11-07.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-658
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-658
- Verification Report_4th monitoring period_28-05-10 to 27-05-11_v2.1.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_5th monitoring period_28-05-11 to 27-05-12_v2.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_28-05-08 to 27-05-09_v1.0.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-1371F883 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy