QUALITY REPORT

Distillerie Coquerel Vineyard

DV-eac4e8 · DOVU dMRV · France

Report ID: CM-2D5A293D · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

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

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, and verification), making it hard to judge whether credits represent real and additional reductions. With low document readability and most key fields not found, the project currently presents high uncertainty and elevated over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

Project Details

Registry	DOVU dMRV
Registry ID	DV-eac4e8
Sector	other
Country	France
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No baseline approach, monitoring period, or quantified emissions reductions were found in the extracted record.
- No evidence of third-party validation/verification (VVB name and confirmation of additionality not found), and extraction confidence is low.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.8 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record (document listed as “unknown”, dated 2022-06-01).

~ No material findings or corrective actions are recorded, but this is not meaningful without a clearly identified verification/monitoring report.

No additionality test, baseline method, baseline reassessment date, leakage deduction/justification, buffer contribution, or reversal information was found in the extracted record (document type listed as “unknown”, dated 2022-06-01). Without these, the robustness of additionality and baseline setting cannot be evaluated and permanence/leakage risks are unaddressed. Although the extracted record shows no material findings and no corrective actions, the absence of an identified VVB report means this provides little assurance.

Transparency — 1.2 / 10

- Monitoring period, monitoring method, registry details, and verified vs claimed reductions were not found in the extracted record.
- Validation/verification body is not identified in the extracted record, limiting auditability.

The extracted record does not provide a monitoring period, usage monitoring method, or any claimed versus verified emissions reductions, so MRV transparency is very limited. The VVB name is not found, and the registry field is also not found, reducing traceability for issuance and verification. Minimum extraction confidence is low, further weakening confidence in what is (and is not) captured.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty around claim boundaries and market-eligibility signaling.
- Key over-crediting controls (baseline method, leakage deduction/justification, and verified ERs) were not found in the extracted record.

Because baseline method, leakage treatment, and verified emissions reductions are not found in the extracted record, the risk of over-crediting cannot be bounded. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not found, so buyers cannot reliably interpret whether the credit is being positioned for higher-integrity claims or compliance-adjacent use. Overall, the lack of quantified and verified outcomes materially elevates greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 1.6 / 10

- Evidence documents are not identifiable beyond “unknown”, and minimum extraction confidence is low despite 6 documents being used.
- Core project descriptors (methodology, crediting period, monitoring period) were not found in the extracted record.

Despite 6 documents reportedly used, the only evidence document label is “unknown” and the document type is “unknown”, dated 2022-06-01, which prevents basic document-level auditability. Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the chance that critical details were missed. Key fields like methodology, monitoring period, and crediting period were not found in the extracted record, indicating incomplete documentation for assessment.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	Additionality assessment not found
● **Permanence**	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● **Leakage**	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● **Baseline**	Baseline method not found
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not found
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/identify the applicable methodology, baseline approach (including reassessment timing), monitoring period, and a clear MRV description with claimed and independently verified emissions reductions.

→ Provide the validation/verification report(s) with the VVB name, any findings/corrective actions, and explicit leakage and permanence provisions (e.g., quantified leakage deduction and buffer/reversal management).

Documents Reviewed

- Crop Details - Cool Farm Tool 2021
- Soil characteristics - Cool Farm Tool 2021
- Fuel and energy - Cool Farm Tool 2021
- Water Use - Cool Farm Tool 2021
- Carbon changes & sequestration - Cool Farm Tool 2021
- Fertiliser inputs and crop residue management - Cool Farm Tool 2021

Report ID: CM-2D5A293D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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