QUALITY REPORT

SAU/NCA/undefined/ICR/19072025/00011

OG-687b52b0 · ICR · Saudi Arabia Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-E3A30EE9 · 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, so core quality attributes (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV) cannot be assessed. Given the soil carbon sector's sensitivity to baseline and permanence assumptions, this level of evidence gap implies high over-crediting and reversal-risk uncertainty.

Project Details

Registry	ICR
Registry ID	OG-687b52b0
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Saudi Arabia 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 additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, or monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability of any potential underlying evidence.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.2 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record (no documents available).

~ Soil carbon projects typically require strong permanence and baseline evidence, but none is available here to evaluate.

No project design, monitoring, or verification documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), so additionality testing, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and permanence risk management (e.g., buffer pool, reversal procedures) cannot be confirmed. Given the project is classified as soil carbon, the absence of evidence is particularly material because crediting depends heavily on baseline assumptions and long-term carbon stock durability.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring/verification information or public-facing documentation was found in the extracted record (no documents available).
- Registry/MRV fields (VVB, monitoring period, errors, methods) are not evidenced due to missing documents.

The extracted record contains no VVB name, monitoring period, quantified results, or error checks because no documents were available. With minimum extraction confidence marked low, even if a source existed it was not reliably readable/usable, which further undermines transparency and MRV traceability.

Claim Safety — 1.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline and monitoring methods are not evidenced in the extracted record.

~ Eligibility/labeling risks (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) cannot be assessed from the extracted record.

Without any stated baseline method, leakage justification/deduction, or monitoring approach in the extracted record, the risk of over-crediting cannot be bounded. No information was found on market-eligibility signals (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status), so buyers cannot reliably assess double-claim/labeling risk from the available evidence.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided/parsed (0 documents used).
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability of at least one key source.

The extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents were used, which is a critical documentation failure for quality assessment. The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key input was poorly readable, further reducing confidence in completeness and accuracy.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	No additionality evidence found
Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
Leakage	No leakage treatment found
Baseline	No baseline method found
Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
Double-claim	Eligibility/labels not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and/or publish the PDD, monitoring report(s), and verification/validation report(s) so additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV can be independently assessed.

→ Disclose permanence risk management (e.g., buffer contribution, reversal monitoring, and remediation procedures) and quantified leakage/baseline assumptions with VVB confirmation.

Report ID: CM-E3A30EE9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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