

QUALITY REPORT

CD/REC/SLR/GS/21072025/00016

OG-687dd7a1 · Gold Standard · Chad Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-4C1F4410 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ 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 documentation beyond basic identifiers, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV results) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claim defensibility is high based on evidence gaps alone.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	OG-687dd7a1
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Chad Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

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

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

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

~ Project is labeled renewable energy avoidance, but the absence of documentation prevents confirming baseline validity and non-over-crediting

No validation/verification or monitoring documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal considerations are not stated in available documents. Because the project is categorized as renewable energy avoidance, baseline and additionality are central to integrity, but neither can be confirmed. With no information on material findings or corrective actions, integrity must be scored conservatively due to the evidence gap.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified results are available in the extracted record

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

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and does not provide a VVB name, monitoring period, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions. MRV methods (such as how generation/usage was monitored) are not found in the extracted record. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the public record is complete and accurately captured.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- No information found on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, baseline parameters, or leakage justification, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk

~ Gold Standard is stated, but without documents the quality controls cannot be confirmed for this specific project

Claim safety is limited by the absence of key eligibility and over-crediting risk indicators: CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, baseline details, and leakage justification are not stated in available documents. Without verified monitoring results or any ERR reconciliation, the risk of overstated climate claims cannot be ruled out. The project being labeled under Gold Standard does not, by itself, provide enough evidence to support strong claims for this specific issuance.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents listed/used in the extracted record, indicating severe documentation incompleteness

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/processing issues

Documentation is extremely incomplete: the extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates that no documents were used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key document was poorly readable and that important details may be missing or unreliable. This warrants a very low documentation score and triggers the post-scoring gate rule that would cap transparency if applied.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer information not found
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and extract the PDD, validation/verification report(s), and monitoring report(s) so additionality, baseline method, leakage treatment, and verified ERs can be assessed

→ Publish/confirm registry fields and eligibility statuses (VVB name, monitoring period, claimed vs verified ERs, CORSIA eligibility and CCP status) and ensure documents are machine-readable to ■■■ extraction confidence

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-4C1F4410 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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