

QUALITY REPORT

# Savimbo Biodiversity Credits (Pre-certified)

DV-3d2afb · DOVU dMRV

Report ID: CM-4DB07905 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>1.7</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>1.8</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>1.0</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>2.2</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>1.5</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, this pre-certified biodiversity credit project lacks the core information needed to assess additionality, baseline validity, leakage, and permanence. With only one poorly readable/low-confidence source document and most key fields not stated, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high.

## Project Details

Registry	DOVU dMRV
Registry ID	DV-3d2afb
Sector	other
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No baseline approach or reassessment timing found in the extracted record, making it impossible to judge whether credits reflect real, additional outcomes
- No additionality test or third-party validation/verification body identified in the extracted record
- No leakage treatment (deduction or justification) found in the extracted record
- Low extraction confidence and only one “unknown” document source materially reduce reliability and auditability

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.8 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions (e.g., buffer or reversal handling) are not stated in the available extracted record

~ Safeguards are mentioned, but FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing details are not stated in the extracted record

The extracted record does not state any additionality test, baseline method, or baseline reassessment timing, so additionality and baseline robustness cannot be evaluated from the available document(s). Leakage is not addressed (no deduction and no justification found), and permanence provisions such as a buffer pool or reversal monitoring are also not stated in the extracted record. While safeguards are mentioned in the source document, key integrity elements like FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and benefit-sharing are not described.

### Transparency — 1.0 / 10

- Monitoring period, monitoring approach, and any quantified results are not stated in the extracted record

- Registry, VVB name, and public-facing MRV/assurance details are not stated in the extracted record

The extracted record provides no monitoring period, monitoring methodology, or usage/field monitoring approach, limiting the ability to audit how biodiversity outcomes are measured. No registry information or VVB identity is provided, and there are no stated claimed-versus-verified results. With only an “unknown” document type and no document date, the public traceability of the project’s MRV is weak.

### Claim Safety — 2.2 / 10

- No quantified outcomes or verification figures are provided in the extracted record, increasing over-claiming/over-crediting risk

~ CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so eligibility-related claim risks cannot be screened

Because no quantified outcomes (claimed or verified) are stated in the extracted record, there is a high risk that any public claims could be difficult to substantiate. Baseline and leakage information are missing, which are common drivers of over-crediting risk in outcome-based crediting. CCP and CORSIA eligibility are not stated, so the risk of inappropriate eligibility-related marketing claims cannot be ruled out.

### Documentation — 1.5 / 10

- Only one document is referenced and it is labeled “unknown,” with low extraction confidence

+ No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record (though this may reflect missing documentation rather than clean assurance)

Only one evidence document is listed and it is labeled “unknown,” and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable. The extracted record lacks dates, methodology identifiers, monitoring periods, and assurance details, suggesting incomplete documentation capture. Although the record shows no material findings or corrective actions, this is not strong evidence of quality given the broader documentation gaps.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Permanence provisions not stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	No leakage treatment found
● <b>Baseline</b>	No baseline method found
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards mentioned, details missing
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CCP/CORSIA status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish and reference the full methodology/baseline approach (including reassessment schedule) and an additionality demonstration, ideally confirmed by an independent VVB

→ Disclose MRV details (monitoring period, indicators, sampling/QA procedures) and provide a clear registry record with issuance/verification documentation and project dates

## Documents Reviewed

- Savimbo SDGs - Climate action

### 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-4DB07905 · 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)