

QUALITY REPORT

IND/OTH/undefined/UCR/19072025/00012

OG-687b68b2 · UCR · India Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-A54BA491 · 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%)	1.2
	■ 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 elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV) cannot be assessed. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high by default.

Project Details

Registry	UCR
Registry ID	OG-687b68b2
Sector	other
Country	India Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing assessment of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring quality
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record

~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of documents

No official project documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method selection, leakage treatment, and any permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool or reversal reporting) are not stated in available documents. With these core integrity elements missing, the project must be scored very low on integrity. The low extraction confidence further increases the chance that any unseen issues would not be detected.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

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

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

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and no monitoring/verification information. Items typically used to judge MRV quality—such as the VVB name, monitoring period, and any error checks—are not stated in available documents. Given the absence of registry-completeness indicators in the extracted record, transparency is scored near the floor.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- Eligibility/quality signals (CORSIA/CCP status) and key parameters that drive over-crediting risk were not found in the extracted record

~ With no quantified baseline/leakage/usage assumptions available, claim risk remains highly uncertain and therefore treated conservatively

Claim safety is low because there is no extracted evidence on baseline setting, leakage justification, or any eligibility status (such as CORSIA or CCP) that would help bound greenwashing and over-crediting risk. With no quantified assumptions or verified performance data available, the safest interpretation is that claims cannot be substantiated. The lack of documentation also prevents checking for double-claiming controls.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, indicating a major evidence gap

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/ingestion issues

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record shows zero documents used and low extraction confidence. This means the assessment cannot rely on primary sources such as a PDD, monitoring report, or verification report. As a result, documentation is scored close to zero.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and link the core documents (PDD, monitoring report(s), verification report(s)) and ensure they are machine-readable to resolve the current evidence gap

→ Disclose key quantified parameters and checks (baseline method and reassessment date, leakage deduction and justification, VVB identity and findings, and any eligibility/label status such as CORSIA/CCP)

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-A54BA491 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy