

QUALITY REPORT

Savimbo Biodiversity Credits (MRV)

DV-f4ba40 · DOVU dMRV

Report ID: CM-8982F556 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	1.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	1.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains too little verifiable information to assess baseline setting, additionality, leakage, or permanence for this biodiversity credit project. With only one poorly readable/low-confidence source and most core MRV fields not found, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high.

Project Details

Registry	DOVU dMRV
Registry ID	DV-f4ba40
Sector	other
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ No baseline approach, additionality test, monitoring period, or quantified results were found in the extracted record
■ Low extraction confidence and only a single, unspecified document source limits reliability and auditability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.8 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record

~ Safeguards are mentioned, but FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are not evidenced in the extracted record

No additionality assessment or confirmation by an independent verifier is found in the extracted record, and the baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing are also not stated. Leakage is not quantified and no justification is provided in the extracted record, and permanence provisions such as a buffer pool or any reversal reporting are not found. While safeguards are mentioned in the available extract, there is no supporting detail on FPIC, grievance mechanisms, or benefit sharing in the extracted record.

Transparency — 1.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed results were found in the extracted record

- Registry/issuance fields and MRV method details were not found in the extracted record

The extracted record does not provide a monitoring period, MRV/monitoring method, or any claimed versus verified results. The verifier identity is not stated, and the registry information is not found in the extracted record. With only an unspecified document listed as evidence, the public traceability of the project's MRV is weak.

Claim Safety — 2.2 / 10

- No quantified outcomes (claimed or verified) were found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting/greenwashing risk

~ CORSIA and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, leaving eligibility/claims-channel risk unclear

Because neither claimed nor verified outcomes are found in the extracted record, it is not possible to evaluate whether credits are conservatively quantified. Baseline and leakage approaches are not stated, which increases the risk that any biodiversity claims could be overstated. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, so downstream claim/label risk cannot be screened.

Documentation — 1.5 / 10

- Only one document of unknown type/date is listed, with low extraction confidence

+ No material findings or corrective actions are recorded in the extracted record (but evidence is limited)

Documentation quality is very weak: only one evidence document is listed and its type and date are unknown. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable, which reduces confidence in completeness. Although no material findings or corrective actions are recorded in the extracted record, the lack of identifiable audit/verification documentation limits the value of that signal.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned, details missing
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the full MRV documentation set (methodology, monitoring report with monitoring period, quantified results, and any verification/assurance statement naming the verifier and findings)
- Disclose baseline and leakage approaches (including any deductions/justifications) and document safeguards implementation (FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing arrangements)

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-8982F556 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy