

QUALITY REPORT

IND/REC/SLR/IREC/17022026/00024

OG-699419ea · I-REC · India Total Credits

Report ID: CM-9E2E9DC4 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

Very limited information was found in the extracted record for this I-REC renewable energy project, with no usable official documents captured. With low extraction confidence and zero documents used, key quality determinants (baseline, additionality, MRV, and safeguards) cannot be substantiated, creating high uncertainty and elevated over-claiming risk.

Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	OG-699419ea
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	India Total Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No official project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, and monitoring claims
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable or not reliably extracted, undermining data reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

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

~ Renewable energy avoidance projects typically have low physical reversal risk, but permanence/buffer provisions were not evidenced in available documents

No project documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any material findings or corrective actions are not stated in available documents. As a result, the core integrity claims for an avoidance renewable energy project cannot be substantiated. While renewable energy generally has low reversal risk, permanence provisions (e.g., any buffer or replacement rules) were not evidenced in the extracted record.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB/assurance details, monitoring period, or error checks were found in the extracted record

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

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and provides no monitoring period, assurance/verification body information, or quantified checks (e.g., claimed vs verified quantities). With low extraction confidence, even the absence of data is less informative because it may reflect unreadable or unparsed source files. Overall, the public/MRV trail cannot be evaluated from the available record.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record, increasing greenwashing and double-claim risk

~ Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and grid/emission factor assumptions were not evidenced

Claim safety is low because eligibility/status indicators and controls relevant to double claiming (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record. Baseline and grid emissions factor assumptions—central to over-crediting risk for renewable energy—are also not evidenced. This creates a high risk that marketing claims could exceed what can be supported by documentation.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided/parsed (0 documents used), indicating severe documentation gaps

- Extraction confidence is low, reducing reliability even for any partial data that might exist

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record lists zero evidence documents and zero documents used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable or extraction was unreliable. These gaps prevent a credible assessment of project design, monitoring, and assurance.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Low reversal risk but not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not documented
● Double-claim	Eligibility/status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and parse core documents (registration/issuance record, monitoring reports, and any third-party assurance statements) so baseline, MRV, and issuance quantities can be verified

→ Disclose double-claim controls and eligibility/status (e.g., whether claims are exclusive, any corresponding adjustments, and any CCP/CORSIA-related status) with clear registry references

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-9E2E9DC4 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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