QUALITY REPORT

# Ovid Wind Farm Project

CT-660 · ICR Standard · Ukraine

Report ID: CM-17C75859 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.5**

Overall Score

out of 10

| | |
|---|---|
| Integrity (35%) | 5.2 |
| Transparency (25%) | 5.6 |
| Claim Safety (25%) | 4.8 |
| Documentation (15%) | 7.2 |

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has a clear renewable-energy methodology (ACM0002 v21.0) and additionality is confirmed by the VVB, with no material findings or corrective actions reported. However, key quantification elements (verified ERs, grid emission factor details, leakage treatment, and baseline reassessment timing) are not present in the extracted record, and conflict-related physical and grid risks are explicitly noted without a corresponding permanence/reversal treatment.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Registry | ICR Standard |
| Registry ID | CT-660 |
| Sector | renewable_energy |
| Country | Ukraine |
| Vintage | 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 |
| Project Methodology | ACM0002 21.0 |
| Crediting Period | 2019 — 2029 |
| VVB | Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. ■ti. |
| Monitoring Period | 2019 — 2023 |
| Confidence | High |
| Documents Reviewed | 3 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-02 |

## Red Flags

■ Verified and claimed emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in credit quantity.

■ Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring documentation, with no stated leakage deduction or justification.

■ Reversal/force majeure risk is explicitly highlighted due to the war context, but no buffer pool or reversal management approach is documented in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a common-practice assessment.

- The monitoring report (2023) flags significant conflict-related damage risk, yet no buffer pool or reversal management is documented in the extracted record.

The validation/verification documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a common-practice test. The baseline is described as project-specific in the extracted record, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents. The monitoring report (2023) explicitly notes major conflict-related risks (missile attacks and grid damage), but no buffer pool percentage, reversal provisions, or reversal events accounting is documented in the extracted record.

### Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2023) clearly states the monitoring period (2019-05-01 to 2023-04-30) and identifies the VVB.

- The extracted record does not include claimed or verified ER totals, nor the grid emission factor/year used for calculations.

The monitoring report (2023-08-03) provides a clear monitoring period (2019-05-01 to 2023-04-30) and names the VVB (Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. ■ti.). However, the extracted record does not include total emission reductions claimed or verified, and does not provide the grid emission factor or the year used, which are central to reproducibility for ACM0002 projects. Leakage treatment is also not described, reducing MRV transparency.

### Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project applies a widely used grid-connected renewable methodology (ACM0002 v21.0), which can reduce methodological discretion when fully documented.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, and missing ER/EF details increase over-crediting and marketing-claim risk.

Because total ERs (claimed and verified) and the grid emission factor inputs are not found in the extracted record, there is elevated risk that external claims could overstate quantified impact. Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring documentation, with no deduction or justification stated, which increases uncertainty even for a wind project. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot readily rely on these labels for low-greenwashing risk claims.

### Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Three core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- The extracted record lacks key quantitative fields (ERs, grid EF, leakage deduction), indicating incomplete disclosure in the available dataset.

The extracted record includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting a solid documentation score. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is a positive signal for audit outcomes. Still, several key quantitative fields (ER totals, grid EF/year, leakage deduction) are missing from the extracted dataset, limiting completeness for independent review.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| **Additionality** | VVB-confirmed common-practice additionality |
| **Permanence** | Conflict-related damage risk noted; no buffer/reversal provisions found |
| **Leakage** | Leakage not addressed; no deduction or justification found |
| **Baseline** | Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not found |
| **Safeguards** | FPIC and grievance mechanism documented |
| **Double-claim** | CORSIA/CCP status not stated in available documents |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and/or extract the verified and claimed ER totals for the 2019–2023 monitoring period, including the full calculation workbook and the grid emission factor value and reference year used under ACM0002.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment and justification (even if negligible) and document any risk management approach for conflict-related damage (e.g., insurance, contingency plans, or any buffer/issuance controls if applicable).

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification Report



Report ID: CM-17C75859 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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