

QUALITY REPORT

IRL/WMC/PWR/VER/26052025/00002

OG-68342e27 · VCS · Ireland Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-D151A9AF · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, and key integrity and MRV details are not available. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting or unsupported claims cannot be meaningfully assessed and should be treated as high until primary documents are provided.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-68342e27
Sector	industrial
Country	Ireland Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, leakage, or monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability of any conclusions.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.2 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any non-conformities are not stated in available documents.
- ~ With no extracted evidence, permanence/reversal and buffer arrangements cannot be evaluated.

No project design, baseline methodology, additionality assessment, leakage treatment, or permanence provisions were found in the extracted record because no evidence documents were captured. As a result, the integrity of credited emission reductions cannot be substantiated from the available materials. The low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that critical integrity-relevant details are missing or unreadable.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or error/uncertainty information is available in the extracted record.
- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be checked because no evidence documents were provided.

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no verification/monitoring reports, no VVB identification, and no monitoring period details. Without these, MRV procedures, data quality controls, and any reported findings cannot be checked. Given the absence of documents, registry completeness and traceability cannot be evaluated here.

Claim Safety — 1.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and key over-crediting risk parameters (baseline and leakage) are not stated in available documents.
- ~ Without documents, there is no way to reconcile claimed vs verified results or assess greenwashing risk.

Claim safety is weak due to the absence of information needed to assess over-crediting risk, including baseline setting, leakage justification, and any reconciliation between claimed and verified results. Eligibility indicators such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status are not found in the extracted record. With no primary evidence, marketing or compliance claims would carry elevated greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, indicating a major evidence gap.
- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues.

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record shows zero documents used and low extraction confidence. This combination indicates both a completeness gap (nothing to review) and a potential readability issue in at least one key source. Until core documents (PDD, validation/verification reports, monitoring reports) are available and readable, the project cannot be credibly assessed.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and/or re-extract core documents (PDD, validation report, latest monitoring report, verification report) with readable text to raise extraction confidence and enable assessment.

→ Disclose key quantified parameters in those documents (baseline method and reassessment date, leakage deduction and justification, any findings/corrective actions, and VVB details) and ensure registry fields are complete.

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-D151A9AF · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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