

QUALITY REPORT

# Savimbo Biodiversity Credits

DV-bd1617 · DOVU dMRV

Report ID: CM-56D4D4B6 · 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>1.2</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>2.0</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>1.5</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, key quality determinants (baseline approach, additionality, leakage, monitoring period, and verification details) are not stated in available documents. Safeguards are mentioned, but there is no extracted evidence of FPIC, grievance mechanisms, or benefit-sharing details. With only one poorly readable/low-confidence source document, the project’s credit quality cannot be substantiated from the provided materials.

## Project Details

Registry	DOVU dMRV
Registry ID	DV-bd1617
Sector	other
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No baseline method or reassessment timing found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk.
- No additionality test or VVB verification details found in the extracted record.
- Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) not found in the extracted record.
- Only one source document was used and extraction confidence is low, limiting reliability.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.8 / 10

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

~ The extracted record shows no material findings or corrective actions, but this is weak evidence given the low-confidence extraction and unknown document type.

The extracted record does not include an additionality test type or confirmation by a VVB, and no baseline method or baseline reassessment timing is stated in available documents. Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no leakage deduction and no justification), and permanence provisions such as a buffer pool percentage or any reversal reporting are also not found. While the extracted record lists no material findings and no corrective actions, the document is of unknown type and the extraction confidence is low, so this provides limited assurance.

### Transparency — 1.2 / 10

- Monitoring period, monitoring approach, and verification outcomes (claimed vs verified results) are not found in the extracted record.

- VVB name and registry details are not stated in available documents.

The extracted record does not provide a monitoring period, monitoring/usage monitoring method, or any claimed-versus-verified results, which prevents assessment of MRV rigor. The verifier identity is not stated in available documents, and registry information is also not found in the extracted record. With only a single, low-confidence source document, transparency is materially constrained. Note: if documentation remains below 3.0, transparency would be capped by the gate rule (applied post-scoring).

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Eligibility/quality signals (CCP status, CORSIA eligibility) are not stated in available documents, limiting defensibility of claims.

- Baseline and leakage information is missing, elevating over-crediting/over-claiming risk.

Because baseline and leakage information are not stated in available documents, the risk of over-crediting or overstated biodiversity outcomes cannot be ruled out. CCP status and CORSIA eligibility are not found in the extracted record, so there is no extracted evidence supporting high-integrity market eligibility claims. The absence of verifier and quantified results further increases greenwashing risk for downstream claims.

### Documentation — 1.5 / 10

- Only one document of unknown type is referenced, and extraction confidence is low.

- Key fields typically present in official documentation (dates, methodology, crediting/monitoring periods, verifier identity) are not stated in available documents.

Only one evidence document is listed and its type is unknown, with low extraction confidence indicating at least one key document was poorly readable. Core documentation elements—methodology and version, document date, crediting period, monitoring period, verifier name, and quantified outcomes—are not stated in available documents. Although safeguards are mentioned in the extracted record, there is no extracted detail on FPIC, grievance mechanisms, or benefit-sharing.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not found
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards mentioned, details missing
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Eligibility/labels not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/submit the full methodology and baseline approach (including reassessment schedule) and provide the monitoring period with quantified results and uncertainty/verification outcomes.

→ Provide independent verification details (VVB name and verification statement) plus explicit leakage assessment (deduction and justification) and documented safeguards (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit-sharing).

## 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-56D4D4B6 · 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)