

QUALITY REPORT

CECIC Zhangbei Dayangzhuang Wind Farm Project

GS-722 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-7E807080 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This wind project has some strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a project-specific baseline under ACM0002. However, the record is weakened by missing or unclear leakage treatment, no buffer pool information, and limited evidence on safeguards and registry/claim status. Overall, it looks moderately documented but not especially robust for high-confidence credit claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-722
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 version 07
Crediting Period	2008 — 2015
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus)
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2015
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the record says leakage was not addressed, yet the contradiction log says another document quantified it.
- No buffer pool, reversal history detail, or claim-status information was found, which weakens permanence and double-claim confidence.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which supports the project's core eligibility case.
- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, and reversal events are not addressed; buffer pool coverage is also not stated.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and names ACM0002 with a project baseline, which is a positive sign for baseline validity. That said, leakage is recorded as not addressed, reversal events are not addressed, and buffer pool coverage is not found in the extracted record, all of which weaken permanence and environmental integrity. The report also notes material findings, though no corrective actions were required.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and multiple source documents were used, which helps traceability.
- Verified and claimed emission reductions are not available in the extracted record, and registry/claim status details are incomplete.

The project has a named VVB, a clear monitoring period from 2013-01-01 to 2015-05-31, and multiple evidence documents were used, which supports traceability. However, the extracted record does not provide verified versus claimed emission reduction totals, and several MRV-related fields such as usage monitoring method and grid emission factor are not found. Registry and claim-status information are also incomplete in the available documents.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + The baseline is project-based under ACM0002, which is a recognized methodology for wind projects.
- Leakage justification is unclear and the contradiction suggests one document may have quantified it while another says it was not addressed, increasing over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is only moderate because the project uses a standard wind methodology, but the leakage treatment is weakly documented. The contradiction on leakage is important: one extracted value says leakage was not addressed, while the contradiction log says another document quantified it; I privileged the more conservative reading because the extracted record does not preserve the quantified value. With no CORSIA or CCP status stated, and no verified usage-rate evidence, over-crediting and dual-claim risk remain unresolved.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

- + Three document types were used, and extraction confidence is high, which supports basic documentation quality.
- The verification report still records material findings, and key items such as buffer pool, grievance mechanism, and claim status are not stated.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. Three document types were used and extraction confidence is high, which helps, but the record still lacks several key fields such as buffer pool percentage, grievance mechanism, and claim-status details. The verification report also records material findings, indicating the documentation was not fully clean even if no corrective actions were required.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No buffer pool stated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment unclear
● Baseline	Project baseline under ACM0002
● Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned but not detailed
● Double-claim	Claim status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full leakage calculation and reconcile the contradiction between the documents so the treatment is explicit and auditable.

→ Disclose buffer pool coverage, reversal monitoring, and registry/claim status details, including whether the project is CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_7th monitoring period_01-01-13 to 31-05-15_v2.0.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_7th monitoring period_01-01-13 to 31-05-15_v2.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_monitoring period_01-01-2013 to 31-05-2015_v1.0.pdf
- PDD_13-08-09.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-722
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-722
- Verification Report_7th monitoring period_01-01-13 to 31-05-15_v2.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_7th monitoring period_01-01-13 to 31-05-15_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-7E807080 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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