

QUALITY REPORT

Biodiversity and Community

CE-biodiversity-and-com · VCS · Indonesia

Report ID: CM-F75B63FB · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.1 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality elements like additionality, baseline setting, leakage, and monitoring cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high by default.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	CE-biodiversity-and-com
Sector	other
Country	Indonesia
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, or MRV.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or misread critical details.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record (no documents captured).

~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying evidence.

No official documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage assessment, and any permanence/reversal provisions cannot be verified. With no monitoring or verification reports available, there is no evidence to confirm that credited emission reductions are real and additional. Given these evidence gaps, integrity is scored very low.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB identity, monitoring period, or verification/monitoring results were found in the extracted record.

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no documents and therefore no information on the VVB, monitoring periods, MRV procedures, or verification outcomes. Public traceability (e.g., what was monitored, when, and by whom) cannot be established from the available record. This warrants a very low transparency score.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and any safeguards against over-crediting were not found in the extracted record.

~ With no ERR figures or baseline parameters available, over-crediting risk cannot be bounded and is treated conservatively.

Claim safety is weak by default because eligibility/status indicators (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval) were not found in the extracted record, and there are no baseline or leakage parameters to evaluate over-crediting risk. With no ERR figures or verification results available, marketing claims would be difficult to substantiate. The score reflects high uncertainty and conservative treatment of missing evidence.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used and no evidence documents were listed in the extracted record.

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability and suggests key information may be missing or unreadable.

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates low extraction confidence. This combination suggests either missing documentation or unreadable sources, both of which materially undermine assessability. As a result, documentation is scored near the bottom.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest validation/verification and monitoring reports so additionality, baseline setting, leakage, and MRV can be assessed.

→ Provide registry extracts (issuance/retirement records) and explicit statements on CORSIA eligibility and CCP status to reduce double-claim and greenwashing 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-F75B63FB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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