QUALITY REPORT

Summerley Hall Fruit Farm

DV-4c08aa · DOVU dMRV

Report ID: CM-33E64C71 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.3

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	2.2
Transparency (25%)	2.0
Claim Safety (25%)	2.6
Documentation (15%)	2.4

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

Assessment Summary

Available documentation for this soil carbon project is too thin to substantiate core quality claims such as additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and permanence controls. While a monitoring approach is referenced (smart metering), most key MRV and accounting parameters are not stated in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Project Details

Registry	DOVU dMRV
Registry ID	DV-4c08aa
Sector	soil_carbon
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Additionality approach and whether it was independently validated are not stated in available documents.
- Baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents.
- No leakage deduction or leakage justification is stated in available documents for a project type where leakage and boundary effects can be material.
- Permanence controls (buffer contribution and any reversal monitoring/events) are not stated in available documents.
- Low document readability/extraction confidence reduces confidence in the completeness and reliability of the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.2 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence controls are not stated in the extracted record (documents include a monitoring report and an unknown document type, dated 2022).

~ No material findings or corrective actions are listed, but the underlying verification/assurance evidence is not provided in the extracted record.

The extracted record does not state any additionality test or whether additionality was confirmed by an independent verifier, which is a major integrity gap for credit issuance. The baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are also not stated in available documents, making it difficult to judge whether credited outcomes are truly beyond business-as-usual. For permanence, neither a buffer pool contribution nor any reversal monitoring/events are stated in the extracted record, which is particularly important for soil carbon where reversals can occur. Leakage is not quantified and no leakage justification is provided in the extracted record (monitoring report referenced; 2022 document date), increasing the risk that net climate benefit is overstated.

Transparency — 2.0 / 10

- Key MRV outputs (claimed vs verified removals) and the verifier identity are not stated in available documents.

+ A usage monitoring method is specified as smart metering in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited because the verifier name is not stated and the monitoring period is not stated in the extracted record, preventing a clear understanding of what time window the reported outcomes cover. The extracted record also does not provide claimed versus verified total removals, so users cannot reconcile issuance with measured performance. A positive element is that a usage monitoring method is specified as smart metering, but this alone does not substitute for full MRV disclosure. Overall, the evidence set (monitoring report plus an unknown document type) is insufficiently detailed for independent scrutiny.

Claim Safety — 2.6 / 10

- Over-crediting risk is elevated because baseline, leakage, and verified vs claimed results are not stated in available documents.

~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, leaving double-claim/market-eligibility risk unclear.

Claim safety is weak because the extracted record lacks the core accounting parameters that typically drive over-crediting risk: baseline approach, leakage treatment, and verified results. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess market-eligibility claims or potential double-claim concerns. The absence of disclosed claimed-versus-verified totals further increases greenwashing risk, because there is no transparent check on whether credits align with verified outcomes. Given the low extraction confidence, any marketing claims should be treated cautiously until primary documents are reviewed.

Documentation — 2.4 / 10

- Minimum extraction confidence is low and the document type is partly unknown, limiting auditability of key claims.

~ Only a small set of evidence documents is referenced (monitoring report plus unknown), with major gaps in quantified parameters.

Documentation quality is low: the minimum extraction confidence is reported as low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable, which reduces confidence that all relevant details were captured. The extracted record references three documents, but only identifies a monitoring report and an unknown document type, and does not surface standard elements like methodology, crediting period, verifier identity, or quantified results. While no material findings or corrective actions are listed, the absence of an identifiable verification/assurance report in the extracted record limits the value of that signal. The 2022 document date suggests some recency, but completeness is the binding constraint.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	No additionality assessment found
Permanence	Permanence controls not evidenced
Leakage	Leakage not quantified or justified
Baseline	Baseline method not stated
Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced; no grievance mechanism
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or provide the methodology and baseline approach (including reassessment schedule) and disclose claimed vs verified removals for a clearly defined monitoring period.

→ Document permanence risk management for soil carbon (buffer contribution, reversal monitoring and response procedures) and provide a leakage assessment with quantified deductions or a robust justification for negligible leakage.

→ Provide an identifiable independent assurance/verification statement (including verifier name) and improve document legibility to raise extraction confidence.

Documents Reviewed

- Agrecalc draft report 2021
- Agrecalc Resource use and Emissions Report 2021
- Agrecalc Resource use and Emissions Report 2022

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-33E64C71 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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