

QUALITY REPORT

AFG/REC/SLR/VER/11032026/00025

OG-69b141e3 · VCS · Afghanistan Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-60B802AC · 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, leakage, and monitoring) cannot be validated. Given the low readability flag and zero documents used, the risk of over-crediting and weak substantiation is high based on available evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-69b141e3
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Afghanistan 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 baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or misread critical details

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Baseline, additionality, leakage treatment, and any permanence risk controls were not found in the extracted record because no documents were available

~ The project is labeled as an avoidance credit type, but permanence/reversal provisions (e.g., buffer pool, reversals) are not evidenced in any document

No official project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used; no evidence documents listed), so additionality testing, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any permanence controls cannot be verified. The low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that key integrity-relevant details are missing or unreadable. Given the sector classification of soil carbon, the absence of any stated reversal risk management (e.g., buffer pool or reversal reporting) is a major evidence gap.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

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

- Registry/documentation completeness is effectively absent in the extracted record (no evidence documents listed)

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record contains no monitoring report, verification report, or PDD references (no evidence documents listed). As a result, basic MRV elements such as the VVB identity, monitoring period, and any quantified uncertainty or error checks are not available. The low extraction confidence also reduces confidence that public-facing documentation is complete or legible.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be assessed because baseline method, leakage justification, and any usage/soil carbon quantification approach are not evidenced

~ Eligibility/labels that affect claims (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) were not found in the extracted record

Claim safety is low because there is no evidence in the extracted record for the baseline method, leakage justification, or quantification approach—key determinants of over-crediting risk. No information was found on CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so potential claim-channel risks cannot be screened. With no documents to corroborate listed credits, any public claims would be difficult to substantiate based on available evidence.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero documents were used and no evidence documents were listed in the extracted record

- Low extraction confidence suggests document quality/readability issues that undermine reliability

Documentation quality is extremely poor in the extracted record: no evidence documents were captured and the number of documents used is zero. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable, which further undermines completeness and reliability. Without core documents (PDD, monitoring, verification), independent review and replication are not possible from the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Reversal controls 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 index the core VCS documents (PDD, monitoring report(s), verification report(s), and issuance/registry records) so baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV can be independently checked
- Resolve the low readability/extraction issue by supplying machine-readable PDFs or higher-quality scans and re-extracting key quantitative fields (baseline parameters, leakage deductions, uncertainty/error, and any permanence/buffer provisions)

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-60B802AC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy