

QUALITY REPORT

USA/OTH/undefined/VER/18072025/00009

OG-687a4788 · VCS · United States Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-8878F2BA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.0
	■ 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 (no PDD, monitoring report, or verification report), and the minimum extraction confidence is low. As a result, additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and MRV quality cannot be substantiated, creating a high risk of over-crediting and weak claim defensibility.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-687a4788
Sector	other
Country	United States Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), so core quality checks (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence) cannot be validated
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or mis-extracted critical information

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any reversal/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record (no documents available)

- No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying evidence

No project design, monitoring, or verification documentation was found in the extracted record (0 documents listed/used), so additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage assessment, and any permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool or reversal procedures) cannot be evaluated. With these core elements unsubstantiated, integrity must be scored very low despite the absence of flagged discrepancies.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

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

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no underlying documents and therefore no information on the VVB, monitoring period, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions. The minimum extraction confidence is low, further weakening confidence that public-facing MRV information was captured reliably.

Claim Safety — 1.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and key over-crediting controls (baseline and leakage justification) were not found in the extracted record

- With no MRV/verification evidence, claims based on listed credits carry elevated greenwashing and over-crediting risk

Claim safety is weak because eligibility/status indicators (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval) and the technical bases that reduce over-crediting risk (baseline setting and leakage justification) were not found in the extracted record. Without verification and monitoring evidence, it is not possible to support high-confidence climate claims tied to the listed credits.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were captured and 0 documents were used in extraction

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing confidence that the record is complete or accurate

Documentation quality is extremely poor: no evidence documents were captured and 0 documents were used in extraction. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the likelihood of missing critical details even if documents exist elsewhere.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and link the core VCS documentation set (PDD, monitoring report(s), verification report(s), and issuance/registry records) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be independently checked

→ Improve document readability/availability (higher-quality scans or text PDFs) and include explicit statements on baseline approach, leakage deduction and justification, VVB identity, monitoring period, and any CORSIA/CCP status

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-8878F2BA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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