

## QUALITY REPORT

# Antares

CC-19 · I-REC · El Salvador

Report ID: CM-7A3F6B70 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 1.5

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

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

## Assessment Summary

Only minimal project identifiers were provided, with no extracted content from official documents. As a result, additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and MRV quality cannot be substantiated, creating high uncertainty and elevated over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

## Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	CC-19
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	El Salvador
Vintage	2022
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

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

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.0 / 10

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

- Project is labeled as renewable energy avoidance, but no supporting baseline or grid/emissions factor evidence is available. No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), so additionality testing, baseline method and reassessment timing, leakage deduction/justification, and any material findings or corrective actions cannot be confirmed. For an avoidance renewable energy project, the absence of baseline and grid emissions factor evidence materially undermines integrity assessment. With low extraction confidence, the risk that key integrity details are missing due to unreadable sources is also elevated.

### Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB/assurance information, monitoring period, or error checks were found in the extracted record

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

Transparency is very limited because no verification/assurance body, monitoring period, or monitoring methodology details were found in the extracted record. Without monitoring reports or verification statements, there is no way to check reported versus verified results or assess MRV rigor. Registry completeness cannot be evaluated beyond the provided registry code because no supporting documentation was included.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and any national/default factors were not provided

Claim safety is weak due to the inability to substantiate the basis for avoided emissions (baseline and factors not provided) and the absence of eligibility/status information that affects marketing claims. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so double-claim/dual-channel risk controls cannot be assessed. Overall, the lack of auditable evidence increases greenwashing and over-crediting risk.

### Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- No documents were used (0), so core claims are not auditable from the extracted record

- Low extraction confidence reduces confidence that any missing items are truly absent versus unreadable

Documentation quality is very poor: the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents were used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source was poorly readable, which further reduces confidence in completeness. With no accessible PDD/monitoring/verification materials, the project is not independently auditable from the provided dataset.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance type, but permanence provisions not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not found
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not found
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not found
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not found

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the core I-REC documentation set (registration, methodology/baseline basis, monitoring reports, and any third-party assurance/verification statements) so baseline, MRV, and issuance can be audited

→ Disclose eligibility/claim controls (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status if applicable, ownership/retirement evidence, and measures to prevent double counting) and publish key monitoring parameters and results

### 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-7A3F6B70 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy