QUALITY REPORT

*Fujian Zhangpu Liuao 45MW Wind Power Project_preCDM VERs

GS-812 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-4B939588 · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	4.8
	Transparency (25%)	4.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
	Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a wind project with a VVB verification report and a combined additionality test, but the evidence base is thin and several key safeguards are not stated. The project has a project-specific baseline and verified issuance of 24,608 credits, yet leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents and the verification report raised a request for clarification on electricity delivery calculations.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-812
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 06 dated 19/05/2006
Crediting Period	2007 — 2014
VVB	SGS United Kingdom Ltd
Verified ERs	24,608 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2007 — 2008
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is contradictory: the monitoring report says it was deemed negligible, while the verification report says it was not addressed.
- A material finding requested clarification on how net electricity delivered to the grid was determined, which weakens confidence in the verified emissions claim.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was assessed using a combined test, and the project was verified by SGS United Kingdom Ltd.

- Leakage handling is inconsistent across documents, and no buffer pool or reversal management is stated.

The project has some positive integrity signals because the verification report from SGS United Kingdom Ltd confirms a combined additionality test and a verified issuance of 24,608 credits. However, leakage is not robustly documented: the monitoring report says it was deemed negligible, while the verification report says it was not addressed, and no buffer pool or reversal management is stated. A material finding also asked the project participant to clarify how net electricity delivered to the grid was determined, which adds uncertainty to the emissions calculation.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period and crediting period are both stated, and the verification report gives a verified issuance figure of 24,608 credits.

- The record does not state the claimed issuance amount, and the monitoring method relies on self-reporting for usage.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring period, crediting period, methodology version, and verifier are all stated in the extracted record. Still, the claimed issuance amount is not found in the available documents, and the usage monitoring method is only described as self-reporting. Public-facing registry completeness is therefore only partial based on the extracted facts.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

+ The project uses ACM0002 under Gold Standard, which is a recognized renewable methodology.

- Leakage justification is disputed between documents, and there is no stated CORSIA or CCP status to reduce double-claim uncertainty.

Claim safety is weakened by the leakage contradiction and by the absence of clear evidence on CORSIA eligibility or CCP status. The project uses ACM0002 for a wind project, which is generally appropriate, but the baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized or jurisdictional baseline. Because the leakage treatment is inconsistent and the verification report raised a calculation clarification, over-crediting risk cannot be ruled out confidently.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ Three document types were used, including a verification report, PDD, and monitoring report, with high extraction confidence.

- Several important items are not stated, including safeguards, grievance mechanism, buffer pool, and additionality confirmation by the VVB.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. Three document types were used and extraction confidence is high, but several key fields are not stated in the available record, including safeguards, grievance mechanism, buffer pool, and additionality confirmation by the VVB. The verification report is dated 2008, close to the monitoring period, which helps recency, but the overall file remains incomplete.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Combined test present, VVB confirmation not stated
Permanence	No reversal or buffer information stated
Leakage	Negligible in one document, not addressed in another
Baseline	Project-specific baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	No safeguards documentation found
Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled leakage assessment and explain why the monitoring report and verification report differ.

→ Publish clear safeguards, grievance, buffer, and reversal-management documentation, plus explicit CORSIA and CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_25-06-07 to 20-01-08_v3.0.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_25-06-07 to 20-01-08_v3.0.pdf
- PDD_12-11-07.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-812
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-812
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_25-06-07 to 20-01-08_v1.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_25-06-07 to 20-01-08_v1.0.pdf

Report ID: CM-4B939588 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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