QUALITY REPORT

Jbel Sendouq-Khalladi (“Khalladi”) wind farm project in Morocco

GS-899 · GS · Morocco

Report ID: CM-334933E1 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
4.8 (Overall Score out of 10)	Integrity (35%)	5.0
	Transparency (25%)	4.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.4
	Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a wind project with a recognized additionality test and a VVB-reviewed monitoring package, but the record shows several unresolved issues and many corrective actions. The biggest concerns are the contradiction on whether additionality was actually verified by the VVB, the conflicting crediting-period dates, and the lack of quantified leakage or buffer-pool information.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-899
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Morocco
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.3
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
VVB	4K Earth Science Private. Limited
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- ■ The documents conflict on whether additionality was VVB-confirmed, and the later validation report is the one that says it was not.
- ■ There are 10 corrective actions and 12 findings listed in the monitoring report, which suggests material documentation or implementation issues.
- ■ Leakage is only described as negligible, with no quantified deduction or supporting method stated.
- ■ The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated, leaving some dual-claim uncertainty.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.0 / 10

+ The project uses an investment test and the monitoring report cites ACM0002 methodology version 12.3, which supports a formal additionality and baseline framework.

- The monitoring report lists 12 findings and 10 corrective actions, and reversal events are not addressed; buffer pool information is also not found in the extracted record.

The project has a formal additionality basis through an investment test, and the methodology is identified as ACM0002 version 12.3, which is a positive sign for baseline structure. However, the monitoring report lists 12 findings and 10 corrective actions, reversal events are not addressed, and no buffer pool information is found in the extracted record, all of which weaken confidence in permanence and implementation quality.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2018-07-01 to 2020-06-30, and the VVB is named as 4K Earth Science Private. Limited.

- Total ERs claimed and verified are not stated, usage monitoring is not described, and the extraction record includes a low-confidence-style gap in several key quantitative fields.

The monitoring period is clearly stated and the VVB is identified, which helps traceability. That said, total ERs claimed and verified are not stated, usage monitoring is not described, and the record does not provide a quantified FNRB or other key public-facing MRV details, so transparency is only moderate.

Claim Safety — 4.4 / 10

+ The project is a wind farm under ACM0002, which is generally a lower-risk renewable category for over-crediting than many land-use projects.

- Leakage is only described as negligible, with no deduction percentage or supporting calculation, and the project is CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not stated.

As a wind project under a standard methodology, the project is in a relatively lower-risk category for over-crediting than many other project types. Still, leakage is only described as negligible without a deduction percentage, and the project is marked CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not stated, leaving some residual claim-safety uncertainty.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

+ The record draws on multiple document types, including a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and appendix, with 16 documents used overall.

- The monitoring report is dated 2024-02-05 while the crediting-period dates conflict with a later validation report, and the large number of corrective actions indicates incomplete or problematic documentation.

The evidence base is reasonably broad, with 16 documents used and references to a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and appendix. Even so, the monitoring report shows many corrective actions, and the crediting-period dates conflict with the later validation report; I privileged the later validation report for the crediting-period update because it is more recent, but the inconsistency itself lowers documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Investment test present, but VVB confirmation is disputed
Permanence	No reversal events addressed; buffer pool not found
Leakage	Negligible leakage claimed, but not quantified
Baseline	Project baseline stated, but reassessment timing missing
Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing documented
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled assurance note that resolves the additionality and crediting-period contradictions across the validation and monitoring documents.

→ Publish quantified leakage treatment, buffer-pool or reversal-risk handling, and clear ER issuance/verification totals for the monitoring period.

Documents Reviewed

- ER calculation_v 3.3(1).xlsx
- GS4GG MR_05-02-2024 Clean.pdf
- DEV_311.pdf
- Khalladi_ER_26 Apr 2024.xlsx
- GS Passport 10.04.2017_v1.1.pdf
- DEV_588.pdf
- T-PreReview_V1.0-Transition-request-form-project.pdf
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form_clean(1).pdf
- T-PreReview_V1.5-Project-Design-Document-5_Clean.docx
- GS5073_Final_SDG Impact Tool_ACWA Power(1).xlsx
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form_5073.pdf
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form_5073(1).pdf
- (1)GS5073 Transition Annex_v4.docx
- PDD 26.07.2015_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-899
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-899
- GS5073_Validation report_clean.pdf
- GS5073 Validation Report_17.10.2017_v1.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-334933E1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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