

QUALITY REPORT

Animal Kingdom

CE-grasslands-water-wil · Verra · Kenya

Report ID: CM-9427CF59 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ 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 (baseline, additionality, 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
Registry ID	CE-grasslands-water-wil
Sector	arr
Country	Kenya
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

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

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Baseline, additionality, leakage treatment, and any reversal/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record due to missing documents.

~ Project is described as an avoidance credit type, but permanence/reversal risk controls cannot be confirmed without documentation.

No validation/verification, PDD, or monitoring information was captured in the extracted record (0 documents), so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any permanence controls (e.g., buffer pool or reversal reporting) are not substantiated. Given the evidence gap, the integrity score is conservative. The project is described as avoidance, but that alone is insufficient to confirm robustness without the underlying documents.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed ER figures were found because no evidence documents were captured.

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed from the extracted record (0 documents; low readability).

Transparency is very limited because no documents were captured in the extracted record, so key MRV elements (monitoring period, VVB identity, and claimed vs verified emission reductions) cannot be checked. Low extraction confidence further suggests that even if sources existed, they were not reliably readable or extractable. As a result, public-data and registry completeness cannot be evidenced here.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline approach and leakage justification were not found in the extracted record.

- CORSIA/CCP status was not found, increasing uncertainty around downstream claim risk.

Claim safety is weak by default because the extracted record provides no basis to evaluate over-crediting controls (baseline selection, reassessment timing, leakage justification/deductions, or usage monitoring). Eligibility signals that affect marketing claims (CORSIA eligibility and CCP status) were not found in the extracted record. With these unknowns, the risk of unsupported or overstated claims is elevated.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- No evidence documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents used).

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability of at least one key source.

Documentation quality is very poor: the extracted record lists zero evidence documents and zero documents used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable, which reduces confidence in completeness and accuracy. This warrants a very low documentation score and triggers the post-scoring gate that would cap transparency if applied.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide core Verra documentation (PDD, validation/verification reports, monitoring reports) so baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV can be assessed.
- Improve document readability/extraction quality (higher-resolution scans or text PDFs) and include registry fields (VVB, monitoring period, claimed vs verified ERs, CORSIA/CCP status).

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-9427CF59 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy