

QUALITY REPORT

IND/REC/BG/GS/21072025/00014

OG-687dcdee · Gold Standard · India Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-3CAF048A · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project facts beyond basic metadata, and the minimum extraction confidence is low. With no evidence of additionality testing, baseline approach, leakage treatment, or verification outcomes, the project cannot be quality-assessed from the available documents and should be treated as high risk until documentation is provided.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	OG-687dcdee
Sector	renewable_energy
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 used), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV claims
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or mis-extracted information

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

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

~ Renewable energy avoidance projects can be robust, but no project-specific evidence is available to confirm

No official project facts were found in the extracted record (no documents listed/used), so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, buffer/reversal provisions, and any material findings or corrective actions cannot be confirmed. Given these evidence gaps, integrity must be scored conservatively until validation/verification and monitoring documentation is available.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verification/monitoring results were found in the extracted record

- No public-document trail is evidenced (no documents listed/used)

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record includes no monitoring period, no VVB identity, and no reported/verified emission reductions or error checks. With no documents referenced, there is no auditable trail to assess MRV quality or registry completeness from the provided extraction.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, grid factors/FNRB, and usage/operational monitoring details were not found

~ Eligibility/labels (e.g., CORSIA/CCP) were not found, so double-claim/label risk cannot be bounded

Claim safety is low because the extracted record does not provide the baseline approach, grid emissions factor/FNRB assumptions, leakage justification, or any verified performance data that would allow screening for over-crediting. CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, leaving label-based claim risks unresolved.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided/used (0 documents), creating a critical evidence gap

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability of any implied completeness

Documentation is critically insufficient: the extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty document list. The minimum extraction confidence is low, which further undermines confidence that key information was captured even if documents existed.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Avoidance type but reversal/buffer not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	No baseline method found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and/or re-extract the Gold Standard PDD, validation report, monitoring report(s), and verification/certification report(s) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be assessed

→ Improve document readability/extraction quality (address the low extraction confidence) and include key quantified fields such as monitoring period, verified ERs, baseline/grid factors, leakage deduction, and any findings/corrective actions

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-3CAF048A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy