

## QUALITY REPORT

# Jeffreys Bay Wind Farm

CT-355 · I-REC · South Africa

Report ID: CM-71AABA4B · 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 beyond basic metadata, so core quality checks (baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV) cannot be substantiated. Given the low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, this project should be treated as high uncertainty and high over-crediting/greenwashing risk until primary documents are reviewed.

## Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	CT-355
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	South Africa
Vintage	2022
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, and monitoring claims
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or incorrect facts

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Project is renewable energy (avoidance), but baseline/additionality/leakage treatment is not found in the extracted record
- No verification/monitoring evidence available to substantiate emissions impact or rule out over-crediting

No project design, baseline approach, additionality assessment, leakage treatment, or permanence controls are available in the extracted record because no evidence documents were captured. As a result, it is not possible to confirm whether the project is additional, whether the baseline is appropriate for South Africa's grid context, or whether any leakage was assessed. With no verification or monitoring reports available, the integrity of any claimed impact cannot be substantiated.

### Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or MRV details found in the extracted record
- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured

The extracted record contains no monitoring period, no verifier information, and no quantified results, so MRV transparency cannot be evaluated. Because no documents were captured, there is also no way to check whether registry fields are complete or whether reported figures reconcile across documents. Low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that key transparency elements are missing.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim controls are not found in the extracted record
- Without baseline and grid factor details, over-crediting risk cannot be bounded

No information is available on eligibility or quality labels (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status), and no controls against double claiming are evidenced in the extracted record. Baseline and grid emissions factor details are not found, so the risk of over-crediting cannot be bounded. Given the absence of primary documentation, marketing or corporate claims based on these credits would carry elevated greenwashing risk.

### Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents captured/used in extraction (no PDD, monitoring report, or verification report available in the extracted record)
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing reliability of any missing/partial information

No evidence documents were captured (0 documents used), so the record lacks the minimum set typically needed (project description, monitoring report, and independent verification). The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the chance of missing critical information. This warrants a very low documentation score and low confidence in any assessment.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project, but no evidence of controls
● <b>Leakage</b>	No leakage treatment found
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not found
● <b>Safeguards</b>	No safeguards evidence found
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not found

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and extract the core document set (I-REC project registration, monitoring reports, and independent verification/assurance statements) with readable scans to raise extraction confidence

→ Disclose baseline/grid emissions factor approach, monitoring period and metering/QA procedures, and any statements on double-claim prevention (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status and registry retirement evidence)

### 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-71AABA4B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)