

QUALITY REPORT

IND/REC/undefined/IREC/17022026/00023

OG-699413a6 · I-REC · India Total Credits

Report ID: CM-F6D4CC49 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ 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 (baseline, additionality, monitoring, and safeguards) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-claiming and misinterpretation is high.

Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	OG-699413a6
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India Total Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

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

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- No evidence found in the extracted record for additionality assessment, baseline approach, leakage treatment, or reversal risk management

~ Project is labeled as renewable energy avoidance, but this is not supported by any extracted official document

No official documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method selection, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. Because the project is described as renewable energy avoidance but without supporting evidence, integrity cannot be substantiated and is scored very low.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

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

- Registry completeness cannot be assessed because no supporting documents were captured

The extracted record contains no monitoring report, verification statement, or VVB identification, so MRV quality and registry completeness cannot be evaluated. With no monitoring period, no reported vs verified ER figures, and no stated methods, transparency is extremely limited.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- No evidence found for CORSIA/CCP status, baseline conservativeness, or leakage justification, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk

~ Registry code is provided, but without documents it does not substantiate eligibility or correct accounting

No information was found on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, baseline conservativeness, or leakage justification, all of which are important to assess over-crediting and greenwashing risk. Given the absence of substantiating documents, claims based on these credits should be treated as high risk.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero evidence documents were captured/used, indicating severe documentation gaps

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues

The extracted record shows zero documents used and low extraction confidence, indicating that either documents were unavailable or unreadable. This is a critical documentation failure and materially reduces confidence in any project attributes.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Avoidance type but 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 the core I-REC documentation set (registration details, generation/issuance evidence, and any audit/assurance statement) so baseline, MRV, and ownership/retirement can be verified

→ Improve document readability/extraction quality (clear PDFs, searchable text) and include VVB/assurance details, monitoring period, and any error checks to support transparent claims

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-F6D4CC49 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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