QUALITY REPORT

Omarchevo Farm

DV-e87d82 · DOVU dMRV · Bulgaria

Report ID: CM-5BDF9F11 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.8 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	1.8
	Transparency (25%)	1.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	Documentation (15%)	2.4

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, key carbon-accounting elements (baseline, additionality, leakage, monitoring period, and quantified results) are not stated in available documents. With low extraction confidence and only an “unknown” document type referenced, the project’s credit integrity and the safety of downstream claims cannot be substantiated from the provided evidence.

Project Details

Registry	DOVU dMRV
Registry ID	DV-e87d82
Sector	other
Country	Bulgaria
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and additionality assessment are not found in the extracted record, making over-crediting risk impossible to evaluate.
- Quantified outcomes (claimed and verified emissions reductions/removals) and the monitoring period are not stated in available documents.
- Low extraction confidence and unclear document provenance (“unknown” evidence docs) undermine reliability of the available information.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.8 / 10

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

~ No material findings or corrective actions are listed, but the absence may reflect missing/unclear documentation rather than confirmed audit outcomes.

The extracted record for “Omarchevo Farm report 2024” does not state any baseline method, baseline reassessment timing, or additionality test, and it does not identify whether additionality was confirmed by a VVB. Leakage treatment is also not stated (no deduction percentage and no justification), and permanence provisions such as a buffer pool or any reversal monitoring are not found in the extracted record. These gaps prevent a robust assessment of additionality, baseline validity, leakage, and reversal risk.

Transparency — 1.2 / 10

- VVB identity, monitoring period, MRV approach, and registry details are not found in the extracted record.
- Low extraction confidence suggests at least one key document was poorly readable, reducing confidence in completeness.

The extracted record does not provide a monitoring period, MRV/usage monitoring method, VVB name, or registry information, which are core transparency elements for third-party scrutiny. While the record indicates three documents were used, the evidence documents are only labeled “unknown,” limiting public traceability. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the available information is complete and accurately captured.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in available documents, increasing risk of ambiguous eligibility/marketing claims.
- Claimed vs verified results are not stated in available documents, preventing checks for over-issuance or verification gaps.

Neither claimed nor verified total emissions reductions/removals are stated in available documents, so there is no way to compare claimed versus verified outcomes or assess over-crediting risk. Baseline and leakage approaches are also not stated, which are central to determining whether credits are conservatively quantified. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, leaving downstream eligibility and marketing claims ambiguous.

Documentation — 2.4 / 10

- Evidence documents are listed only as “unknown” and the document type is “unknown,” limiting traceability and auditability.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating potential unreadable/poor-quality source material.

Documentation quality is weak because the document type and evidence documents are listed as “unknown,” and key project parameters (crediting period, monitoring period, methodology) are not stated in available documents. Although the record references a 2024 report and three documents used, low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable. The absence of listed corrective actions does not compensate for missing core content and unclear provenance.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/attach the full methodology, baseline description (including reassessment timing), and a clear additionality demonstration, ideally confirmed in an independent verification report naming the VVB.

→ Disclose the monitoring period, MRV procedures (including any usage/activity monitoring), and the claimed vs verified total emissions reductions/removals with calculation spreadsheets and uncertainty/QA-QC checks.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment (deduction percentage and justification) and permanence risk management (buffer contribution and reversal monitoring/reporting, if applicable).

Documents Reviewed

- Omarchevo Farm report 2022
- Omarchevo Farm report 2023
- Omarchevo Farm report 2024

Report ID: CM-5BDF9F11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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