

QUALITY REPORT

UGA/EEF/undefined/VER/26052025/00003

OG-683434e2 · VCS · Uganda Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-5DFC2634 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project facts beyond basic metadata, and no underlying documents were available to substantiate additionality, baseline setting, leakage, or monitoring. With low extraction confidence and zero documents used, the project cannot be credibly assessed and should be treated as high risk until primary documentation is provided.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-683434e2
Sector	industrial
Country	Uganda Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, or MRV claims
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- No evidence found in the extracted record for additionality, baseline method, leakage treatment, or reversal risk management

~ Project is labeled as an avoidance credit type, but the underlying basis for avoidance is not documented in the extracted record

No project design or assurance documents were available in the extracted record (no evidence documents listed; 0 documents used), so additionality, baseline validity, leakage, and permanence/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. The project is described as an avoidance type, but the mechanism of avoidance and any safeguards against over-crediting cannot be evaluated without a PDD, monitoring report, and verification report. Given these evidence gaps, integrity is scored very low.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (VVB, monitoring period, errors, methods) found in the extracted record

- No evidence documents listed, so public traceability and registry completeness cannot be confirmed

Transparency is weak because the extracted record contains no monitoring period, no VVB name, and no quantified MRV elements (such as claimed vs verified emission reductions). With no documents available, there is no way to trace methods, data sources, or audit outcomes. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that missing items are truly absent rather than unreadable.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- No information found on baseline approach, leakage justification, or eligibility statuses that would reduce over-crediting/greenwashing risk

~ Registry code is provided (OG-683434e2), but no supporting documentation is available to validate what was issued and on what basis

Claim safety is low because there is no documented baseline method, leakage treatment, or eligibility information (such as CORSIA or CCP status) in the extracted record. Without these, the risk of over-crediting and marketing claims that exceed the evidence cannot be screened. The only identifier provided is a registry code, which is insufficient on its own to support safe claims.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents used and no evidence documents listed in the extracted record

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/availability problems

Documentation is extremely weak: the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source was poorly readable, which further undermines completeness and reliability. This warrants a very low documentation score and triggers the post-processing gate where transparency would be capped due to documentation being below 3.0.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports so additionality, baseline setting, leakage, and MRV results can be assessed
- Provide registry/issuance documentation and eligibility statements (e.g., CORSIA and CCP status) plus any corrective action/material finding logs from the VVB

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-5DFC2634 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy