

QUALITY REPORT

Stopping Ocean Plastic

CT-317 · Gold Standard · Indonesia

Report ID: CM-05D44D66 · 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 assessed. Given the very low documentation completeness and low extraction confidence, the risk of over-crediting or misleading claims cannot be ruled out.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CT-317
Sector	other
Country	Indonesia
Vintage	2022
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

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

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any corrective actions were not found in the extracted record
- No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying documents

No project design or assurance documents were provided in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. With no monitoring or verification report content available, it is not possible to confirm whether any material findings or corrective actions existed. This results in a very low integrity score due to major evidence gaps.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (period, VVB, errors, methods) were found in the extracted record
- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be evaluated because no evidence documents were provided

The extracted record does not include a VVB name, monitoring period, verification outcomes, or any quantified uncertainty/error information, so MRV transparency cannot be evaluated. No evidence documents were listed, and the minimum extraction confidence is low, which further reduces confidence that the public record is complete or readable. Transparency is therefore scored very low.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Eligibility/labels that affect claim risk (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) were not found in the extracted record
- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline and leakage assumptions are not available

Because baseline and leakage assumptions are not available in the extracted record, the risk of over-crediting cannot be assessed. Status indicators that would affect downstream claims (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval) were not found in the extracted record, increasing greenwashing risk for any public claims. Claim safety is therefore low.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided and 0 documents were used
- Low extraction confidence suggests poor readability of at least one key document

The extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates that zero documents were used, which is a critical documentation gap. In addition, the minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source was poorly readable. Documentation is scored near the bottom as a result.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports (including baseline, additionality test, leakage assessment, and quantified results) so the crediting basis can be evaluated

→ Provide registry and assurance details (VVB name, monitoring period, findings/corrective actions, and any eligibility/label status such as CCP/CORSIA) and ensure documents are machine-readable to raise extraction confidence

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-05D44D66 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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