QUALITY REPORT

Red Hill Farm

DV-8bd31b · DOVU dMRV

Report ID: CM-EB71C126 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.0 Overall Score out of 10	
■ Integrity (35%)	1.8
■ Transparency (25%)	1.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.4
■ Documentation (15%)	1.6

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record for Red Hill Farm (DOVU dMRV) contains major evidence gaps on baseline setting, additionality, leakage, and monitoring results, making credit quality hard to substantiate. While the project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, the lack of quantified MRV outputs and missing methodology details materially increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Project Details

Registry	DOVU dMRV
Registry ID	DV-8bd31b
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, so the counterfactual emissions/removals cannot be evaluated.

■ No additionality test or VVB confirmation found, weakening confidence that credits represent beyond-business-as-usual outcomes.

■ No monitoring period, verified ER/ERR totals, or usage monitoring method found, limiting traceability of issued claims.

■ Low document readability/extraction confidence and only one unidentified source document reduce reliability of the dataset.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.8 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record (single unknown document dated 2022-04-27).

~ No material findings or corrective actions are listed, but the absence of core quantification details limits how meaningful this is.

The extracted record does not provide an additionality test or confirmation by an independent verifier, so additionality cannot be substantiated from the available document (unknown, dated 2022-04-27). No baseline method or baseline reassessment date is provided, preventing evaluation of baseline validity. Leakage treatment is also not evidenced: neither a leakage deduction nor a justification is found in the extracted record. Permanence provisions (such as a buffer pool contribution) and any reversal reporting are not found, leaving reversal risk management unclear.

Transparency — 1.2 / 10

- Monitoring period and verified vs claimed ER/ERR totals were not found in the extracted record, preventing MRV cross-checks.
- The VVB name and monitoring/usage measurement approach were not found, reducing auditability.

Key MRV elements are missing from the extracted record: the monitoring period, total claimed ER/ERR, and total verified ER/ERR are not provided, so there is no way to reconcile claims to verification outcomes. The verifier identity is not found, and the usage/measurement monitoring method is not stated, reducing auditability. The evidence base is thin (one document listed as unknown), which further limits transparency for third-party review.

Claim Safety — 3.4 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing one channel of eligibility-related claim risk.

- Methodology, baseline, leakage justification, and quantified results were not found, elevating over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of CORSIA-related marketing claims. However, the extracted record lacks the methodology, baseline approach, leakage justification, and any quantified verified results, which increases the risk that any public claims could be overstated or not reproducible. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so there is no additional assurance from CCP alignment.

Documentation — 1.6 / 10

- Only one evidence document is listed and it is unidentified (document type shown as unknown), limiting completeness and verifiability.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable.

Documentation quality is weak because only one evidence document is referenced and it is not identified by type or title beyond 'unknown' (dated 2022-04-27). Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating readability/parse issues that reduce confidence in completeness. While no material findings or corrective actions are listed, the absence of core project quantification and assurance details suggests the extracted record is incomplete rather than cleanly audited.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	No additionality assessment found
Permanence	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
Baseline	Baseline method not stated
Safeguards	No FPIC/grievance/safeguards evidenced
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or provide the applicable methodology and a clear baseline description (including when it was last reassessed) along with quantified parameters used.

→ Provide complete MRV outputs for a defined monitoring period, including claimed vs verified ER/ERR totals and the independent verifier identity, plus leakage and permanence risk management (buffer/reversal reporting).

Documents Reviewed

- Agrecalc Report 2022 - Resource use and Emissions

Report ID: CM-EB71C126 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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