

QUALITY REPORT

Jasmine Liquid Tokens

CC-18 · I-REC

Report ID: CM-045913A2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality attributes (baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV) cannot be assessed. Given the evidence gaps and low extraction confidence, the project scores very low on transparency, claim safety, and documentation, with integrity also highly uncertain.

Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	CC-18
Sector	other
Vintage	2023
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, and monitoring claims
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record

- ~ Credit type is listed as avoidance, but the underlying activity and quantification basis are not documented here

No project documents were provided in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage assessment, and any permanence/reversal provisions cannot be checked. With no verification/monitoring reports available, there is no basis to confirm whether the avoidance claims are conservative or whether any material findings/corrective actions occurred. This results in a very low integrity score driven by evidence gaps rather than confirmed deficiencies.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (periods, VVB, errors, methods) were found in the extracted record

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be evaluated because no evidence documents were provided

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and no MRV details (such as monitoring period, verifier identity, or quantified uncertainty/error checks). Low extraction confidence further suggests that even if documents existed upstream, they were not reliably readable/extracted here. As a result, the project cannot be independently scrutinized from the provided materials.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- Over-crediting and greenwashing risk cannot be screened because baseline and MRV details are not available in the extracted record

- ~ I-REC instruments can be used in multiple claim contexts, but eligibility/guardrails (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) are not stated here

Claim safety is low because key over-crediting controls—baseline setting, leakage treatment, and monitoring methods—are not available in the extracted record. Eligibility signals that would reduce double-claiming/dual-channel risks (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) are also not stated. Without these, buyers face elevated greenwashing risk due to unverifiable claims.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided (0 documents used), indicating severe documentation incompleteness

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing confidence in any missing/absent fields

Documentation is extremely incomplete: the extracted record lists zero documents used and provides no references to a PDD, monitoring report, or verification report. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable, which further undermines confidence in the completeness of the extracted dataset. This warrants a near-minimum documentation score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence/reversal provisions not documented
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not documented
● Double-claim	Eligibility/claim controls not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the core I-REC documentation set (project description, issuance/registration records, monitoring/measurement approach, and any third-party assurance) so baseline and MRV can be evaluated
- Disclose verifier/assurance details, monitoring period(s), and any quantified uncertainty/error checks, plus explicit statements on claim use/eligibility (e.g., CORSIA/CCP or other claim restrictions) to reduce double-claiming risk

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-045913A2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy