

QUALITY REPORT

UN-DO

DV-800a67 · DOVU dMRV · Uk

Report ID: CM-59137849 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.9

Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| ■ Integrity (35%) | 2.2 |
| ■ Transparency (25%) | 1.0 |
| ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 2.1 |
| ■ Documentation (15%) | 2.4 |

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains major evidence gaps on core carbon-accounting elements (baseline, additionality, leakage, monitoring period, and verified removals), which makes it hard to judge whether credits are robust. While safeguards are mentioned and no reversals are reported, the permanence claim is not supported by a documented buffer or quantified durability evidence in the available extracts.

Project Details

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| Registry | DOVU dMRV |
| Registry ID | DV-800a67 |
| Sector | dac |
| Country | Uk |
| Vintage | Recent |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 6 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-02 |

Red Flags

- No baseline approach or methodology details found in the extracted record, despite a DAC sector classification.
- No additionality test or VVB confirmation found in the extracted record.
- No monitoring period, claimed removals, or verified removals found in the extracted record.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, reducing reliability of the dataset.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.2 / 10

- Baseline, additionality, leakage treatment, and buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record (methodology and verification details not captured).

~ Reversals are reported as none, but permanence is asserted qualitatively ("100,000+ years") without supporting quantified durability/buffer evidence in the extracted record.

Core integrity elements are not evidenced in the extracted record: no baseline method, no additionality test, no leakage deduction or justification, and no buffer pool percentage are provided. The record states reversals as none and includes a qualitative permanence statement ("100,000+ years"), but no supporting quantified durability approach or risk management provisions are captured. No material findings or corrective actions are listed, but without a named VVB or verification details this provides limited assurance.

Transparency — 1.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or claimed vs verified removal totals were found in the extracted record.

~ Safeguards are mentioned, but key public MRV fields (methods, parameters, registry details) are not captured in the extracted record.

Transparency is weak because the extracted record lacks the monitoring period, the monitoring/usage monitoring method, and the claimed versus verified removal totals. The VVB name is not found, and registry information is not captured, limiting traceability. Although safeguards are mentioned, the absence of key MRV fields prevents independent replication or review.

Claim Safety — 2.1 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be assessed because baseline method, leakage justification/deduction, and verified removals are not found in the extracted record.

~ CORSIA and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, leaving buyer-claim channel risks unclear.

Claim safety is low because the extracted record does not provide the baseline approach, leakage treatment, or any verified removal quantity, which are necessary to judge over-crediting risk. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily determine how the credits should be marketed or whether additional claim constraints apply. The permanence claim is qualitative and not tied to a documented durability accounting approach in the extracted record.

Documentation — 2.4 / 10

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable.

- Document metadata is largely missing (dates, document types, registry code linkage), limiting auditability despite 6 documents reportedly used.

Documentation quality is constrained by low extraction confidence, suggesting at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the chance that critical details were missed. While 6 documents were reportedly used and an item labeled "methodology" appears in the evidence list, the methodology version, document dates, and other metadata are not captured. This incompleteness materially reduces confidence in any assessment derived from the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| ● Additionality | No additionality assessment found |
| ● Permanence | No reversals reported, but durability/buffer not evidenced |
| ● Leakage | Leakage treatment not found |
| ● Baseline | Baseline method not found |
| ● Safeguards | Safeguards mentioned, but details missing |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA/CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full methodology and monitoring/verification reports with readable text, including baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage assessment, and uncertainty/QA-QC procedures.

→ Publish registry-linked issuance data and MRV results (monitoring period, claimed and verified removals, VVB identity, and any findings/corrective actions) to enable independent traceability and claim validation.

Documents Reviewed

- UNDO's MRV Approach
- UNDO's Lifecycle Analysis
- UNDO's Approach to Heavy Metals
- ERW and UNDO FAQs
- ERW - THE BENEFITS
- Enhanced rock weathering: the basics.

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-59137849 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy