

QUALITY REPORT

Seaweed Generation: Sinking Sargassum for Carbon Dioxide Removal

CT-518 · Gold Standard · Antigua and Barbuda

Report ID: CM-6EC7B3E9 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.9

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.2
■ Documentation (15%)	0.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, MRV, leakage, and permanence) 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	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CT-518
Sector	biomass
Country	Antigua and Barbuda
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, MRV, leakage, and permanence claims
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and reversal risk management were not found in the extracted record due to missing documents

~ Project type implies non-trivial permanence and monitoring challenges (biomass sinking), but no evidence was available to assess them

No official documents were captured in the extracted record (evidence documents list is empty), so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions cannot be verified. With low extraction confidence, even if documents exist elsewhere, the current evidence base is insufficient to support integrity claims. This warrants a very conservative integrity score.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or quantified MRV outputs were found because no evidence documents were captured

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be assessed from the extracted record

Because no documents were extracted, there is no verifiable information on the VVB, monitoring period, monitoring methodology, or any comparison of claimed versus verified removals. Registry completeness and public transparency cannot be assessed from the extracted record. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence in any implied transparency.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- No evidence was found on eligibility/labels (e.g., CORSIA/CCP) or safeguards against over-crediting because documents are missing

~ Contribution crediting may reduce offset-claim risk, but without documentation the claim framing cannot be verified

No extracted documentation supports how credits are framed (including whether contribution claims are properly bounded) or whether the project is eligible under programs like CORSIA/CCP. Without baseline and MRV details, over-crediting risk cannot be ruled out and must be treated as high. As a result, claim safety is scored very low.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, leaving major evidence gaps

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues

The extracted record shows zero documents used and low extraction confidence, indicating severe documentation gaps and/or unreadable source material. Key expected documents (PDD, validation/verification reports, monitoring reports) were not found in the extracted record. This drives the documentation score close to the minimum.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal risk not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	No baseline method found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	Eligibility/status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide and extract the PDD plus the latest validation/verification and monitoring reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, and permanence provisions can be assessed
- Disclose quantified MRV details (monitoring period, methods, uncertainty, and verified vs claimed removals) and any program eligibility/claiming guidance (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status and contribution-claim rules)

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-6EC7B3E9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy