QUALITY REPORT

*Honiton Energy Bailingmiao Phase One Windfarm Project

GS-794 · Gold Standard · China

Report ID: CM-D2F0690D · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.8
Transparency (25%)	5.4
Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a reasonably documented wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality, a 25% buffer pool, and no reported reversal events. However, leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, and the project is marked CORSIA-eligible and CCP-approved, which raises dual-claim risk and lowers claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-794
Sector	other
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 ver. 7
Crediting Period	2008 — 2015
VVB	TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2011
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

■ Leakage justification is inconsistent: one monitoring report treated leakage as negligible, while a later report says it was not addressed.

■ The project is CORSIA-eligible and CCP-approved, so dual-channel claim risk remains unless registry and retirement status are clearly tracked.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test, and the VVB is named as TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program.

- Leakage handling is weakly documented: the later monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, even though an earlier report described it as negligible.

The verification report confirms additionality using a combined test, and the project has a 25% buffer pool with no reversal events reported in the extracted record, which supports permanence for a wind project. On the negative side, leakage is inconsistently treated: one monitoring report described it as negligible, while a later monitoring report says it was not addressed, so I score this conservatively. The baseline is project-based and was last reassessed in 2008, which is acceptable but not especially strong for robustness.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period from 2009-05-01 to 2011-12-31, and Gold Standard registry identification.

- Claimed versus verified emission reduction totals are not stated in the extracted record, and the usage monitoring method is also not found.

The documentation identifies TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program as the verifier and gives a clear monitoring period, but the extracted record does not state the claimed or verified emission reduction totals. The usage monitoring method is also not found, which limits MRV transparency. Gold Standard registry identification is present, but the record is incomplete on several core reporting fields.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project uses ACM0002 with a project baseline and reports a 25% buffer pool, which supports conservative accounting for a wind project.

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP approval increase the risk of overlapping market claims, and the leakage treatment is not consistently justified.

The project appears safer than many offset projects because it is a wind project under ACM0002 with a project baseline and a substantial buffer pool. Still, the project is marked CORSIA-eligible and CCP-approved, so claim safety is weakened by potential dual-market or overlapping claim risk unless retirement and chain-of-custody controls are clear. The leakage inconsistency further reduces confidence that the credited reductions are fully conservative.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including a verification report, monitoring reports, and the PDD, with 13 documents noted in the extracted record.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the record shows several unresolved or inconsistent items, including leakage justification and additionality test wording.

The evidence base is fairly broad, including a verification report, monitoring reports, and the PDD, and the extracted record notes 13 documents used. The VVB is named, and the record includes material findings that were closed, which is a positive sign. However, extraction confidence is only medium, and some key items remain missing or inconsistent, especially around leakage and the exact additionality test description.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Buffer pool present, no reversals reported
Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible and CCP-approved

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear final leakage assessment and reconcile the conflicting monitoring report statements.

→ Provide verified claimed-versus-issued emission reduction totals and explicit retirement/ownership tracking to reduce dual-claim risk.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-09 to 31-12-11_v2.0.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_07-01-08 to 30-04-09_v3.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_07-01-08 to 30-04-09_v3.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-09 to 31-12-11_v2.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_07-01-2008 to 30-08-2009_v2.pdf
- Honiton BLM1_MSC_Report_080131.pdf
- PDD_12-10-15.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-794
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-794
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-09 to 31-12-11_v1.0.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-05-09 to 31-12-11_v1.0.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_07-01-08 to 30-04-09_v1.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_07-01-08 to 30-04-09_v1.0.pdf

Report ID: CM-D2F0690D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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