

QUALITY REPORT

# Briyastovo Wheat Farm

DV-ad4f84 · DOVU dMRV · Bulgaria

Report ID: CM-706BADAD · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>1.3</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>1.6</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>0.8</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>1.5</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>1.2</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains major evidence gaps for core carbon-accounting elements (baseline, additionality, leakage, monitoring period, and verified results). With low document readability and only unidentified source documents, the project’s credit integrity and claim reliability cannot be substantiated from the available materials.

## Project Details

Registry	DOVU dMRV
Registry ID	DV-ad4f84
Sector	other
Country	Bulgaria
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No baseline approach or reassessment timing found in the extracted record, making over-crediting risk impossible to evaluate
- No additionality assessment or VVB confirmation found in the extracted record
- No monitoring period, claimed ERs, or verified ERs found in the extracted record
- Low extraction confidence and documents listed only as “unknown” undermine reliability and auditability

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.6 / 10

- Baseline, additionality, leakage treatment, and permanence/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record (documents listed as unknown, dated 2021-12-15).

~ No material findings or corrective actions are recorded, but this is not meaningful without a readable verification/monitoring report (unknown documents).

No additionality test, VVB confirmation, baseline method, leakage deduction/justification, buffer pool, or reversal information was found in the extracted record (documents listed as unknown, dated 2021-12-15). Without these elements, additionality robustness, baseline validity, and permanence/leakage controls cannot be evaluated. Although no material findings or corrective actions are recorded, the absence of a clearly identified verification/monitoring report makes this weak evidence of quality.

### Transparency — 0.8 / 10

- Key MRV fields (monitoring period, methodology, VVB name, claimed vs verified ERs) were not found in the extracted record (unknown documents).

- Registry details and eligibility flags (CORSIA/CCP) were not found in the extracted record, limiting traceability (unknown documents).

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record does not provide a monitoring period, methodology, VVB name, or any claimed-versus-verified emissions reduction figures (unknown documents). Registry information is also not found in the extracted record, reducing traceability. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that missing items are truly absent rather than unreadable.

### Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be assessed because baseline method, leakage justification/deduction, and quantified ER results were not found in the extracted record (unknown documents).

- Double-claim/market-eligibility risk cannot be screened because CORSIA and CCP status were not found in the extracted record (unknown documents).

Claim safety is low because the extracted record lacks the baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any quantified claimed or verified results (unknown documents). CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot reliably assess market-eligibility or double-claim risk channels. With these gaps, the risk of over-crediting or unsupported marketing claims is high.

### Documentation — 1.2 / 10

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

- Evidence documents are unidentified ("unknown") and core fields are missing despite two documents being used, indicating incomplete/insufficient documentation.

Documentation quality is poor: the evidence documents are only labeled "unknown," and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating readability/parse issues. Only two documents were used, yet core project accounting fields (methodology, monitoring period, ER totals, VVB identity) are missing from the extracted record. The document date (2021-12-15) is present, but it is not linked to a clearly identified document type (listed as unknown).

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Permanence/buffer not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not found
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not found
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not found
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full monitoring and verification documentation with identified document types, VVB name, monitoring period, and claimed vs verified ER totals.

→ Disclose the applied methodology and baseline approach (including reassessment timing), plus leakage treatment (justification and any deduction) and permanence provisions (buffer/reversal procedures).

## Documents Reviewed

- Cool Farm Tool, biodiversity assessment 2021
- Cool Farm Alliance assessment report 2021

### 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-706BADAD · 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)