

QUALITY REPORT

CECIC Zhangbei Dayangzhuang Wind Farm pre-CDM VER Project

GS-913 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-6FC08400 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a wind project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported, which supports the integrity case. However, key items are either not stated or only partially documented, including baseline reassessment, leakage treatment, and crediting-period consistency, which weakens confidence in the claim quality.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-913
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 07 of 30 November 2007
Crediting Period	2008 — 2015
VVB	ERM Certification and Verification Services
Monitoring Period	2008 — 2008
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the verification report says leakage was not addressed, while the monitoring report says it was deemed negligible.
- The crediting period differs between the PDD and the monitoring report, indicating document inconsistency and some reliability risk.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test in the verification report, and no material findings were reported.

- Leakage is not clearly robust: the verification report says it was not addressed, even though the monitoring report later describes it as negligible with a 0% deduction.

The verification report dated 2011-01-10 confirms additionality through a combined test and reports no material findings, which is a meaningful positive. On the other hand, the report says leakage was not addressed, while the monitoring report dated 2010-12-30 says leakage was deemed negligible with a 0% deduction, so the leakage case is only moderately robust. No reversal events are described, but buffer pool coverage is not found in the extracted record and reversal treatment is not addressed in detail.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and a public Gold Standard registry reference.

- Verified and claimed emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and several MRV details such as grid factor year and usage monitoring method are not found in available documents.

The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a Gold Standard registry reference, which supports basic traceability. Still, the extracted record does not include verified versus claimed emission reduction totals, and several MRV fields such as grid emission factor year and usage monitoring method are not found in available documents. That leaves the public accounting trail incomplete.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is a wind farm under ACM0002, which generally lowers over-crediting risk compared with more complex project types.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and leakage justification is inconsistent across documents.

As a wind project using ACM0002, the project type is generally lower risk for over-crediting than many land-use projects. However, the baseline is project-specific, the baseline reassessment timing is not stated, and leakage treatment is inconsistent between the verification report and monitoring report. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

+ Three document types were used, including the verification report, PDD, and monitoring report, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- Important fields are missing or not stated, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment, and several MRV parameters, which limits documentation completeness.

The evidence base includes the verification report, PDD, and monitoring report, which is a solid starting set, and extraction confidence is medium. Even so, several key items are missing or not stated, including buffer pool percentage, baseline reassessment, verified emission totals, and usage monitoring details. The differing crediting-period dates between the PDD and monitoring report also reduce documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No reversal detail; buffer not stated
● Leakage	0% deduction but justification inconsistent
● Baseline	Project baseline; reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, document-consistent leakage assessment and explain why the 0% deduction is justified across all reports.

→ Disclose verified versus claimed emission totals, baseline reassessment history, and buffer pool or reversal treatment details.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_05-11-2008 to 26-10-2008_v3.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_05-11-08 to 26-10-08_v3.0.pdf
- PDD_16-04-2008.pdf
- (1)PDD_16-04-2008.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-913
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-913
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_05-11-08 to 26-10-08_v3.0.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_05-11-2008 to 26-10-2008_v3.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-6FC08400 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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