

QUALITY REPORT

UpEnergy-Social and Climate Impact Programme- Nigeria-1

VCS-2673 · VCS · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-9672AA2B · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	3.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	2.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.5
	■ Documentation (15%)	2.0

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

Assessment Summary

Significant weaknesses and data inconsistencies reduce confidence in this project's credits. The latest verification report shows many corrective actions and unresolved issues (baseline, fNRB, additionality) and extraction confidence is low; documentation is therefore weak and claim safety is poor.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2673
Sector	other
Country	Nigeria
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	VM0050 1.0
Crediting Period	2022 — 2029
VVB	SustainCERT S.A.
Verified ERs	40,188 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	40 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Numerous material findings and corrective actions on additionality, baseline and fNRB in the verification report (2026-03-30).
- Large contradictions in key metrics (ERRs, fNRB, leakage deduction, usage rates) across documents, undermining data reliability.
- Low extraction confidence from source documents (min_extraction_confidence is low).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.5 / 10

- multiple unresolved verification findings on additionality and baseline (verification report 2026-03-30: corrective actions required: further investment analysis, justify baseline scenario, fNRB calculation).

~ uncertain treatment of reversals and leakage: leakage deduction of 95% is present in extracted fields but leakage justification is reported as not addressed (verification report 2026-03-30), indicating inconsistent handling.

Integrity is weak. The verification report (2026-03-30) confirms additionality was assessed but flagged incomplete investment analysis and NPV documentation and required further third-party assessment, undermining additionality robustness. Baseline credibility is questioned — the verification report requires the VVB to clearly state and justify the baseline scenario. Reversals are flagged in project risks but reversal treatment is listed as not addressed in the latest report; leakage is inconsistently reported (a leakage deduction of 95% appears in extracted fields but the verification report states leakage justification is not addressed). These findings and unresolved CARs lower integrity.

Transparency — 2.0 / 10

- low extraction confidence and only one listed evidence doc labelled unknown (min_extraction_confidence is low; evidence_docs contains 'unknown'), reducing traceability.

+ monitoring period and verified ERR are reported in the verification report (monitoring period 2022-11-01 — 2024-10-31; total verified ERR 40,188 in extracted data), though these figures contradict earlier documents.

Transparency is limited. The monitoring period and a verified ERR figure are present (monitoring period 2022-11-01 — 2024-10-31; total verified ERR reported as 40,188 in the extracted record), but those figures strongly contradict earlier reported ERRs and claimed totals. The evidence_docs list is unhelpful ('unknown') and minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing traceability. The VVB name (SustainCERT S.A.) and many verification details are available, but contradictions and poor extraction confidence reduce effective transparency.

Claim Safety — 2.5 / 10

- CCP status is eligible and there is contradiction about approval; dual-channel risk present (ccp_status listed as eligible, contradiction shows approved in an earlier doc).

~ usage rates: verified usage 0.897 vs assumed 0.94, which is plausible, but huge contradictions in usage figures in older docs (e.g., usage_rate_verified earlier reported as 6.0) undermine reliability.

Claim safety is low. The project is listed as CCP-eligible and there is a contradiction indicating it may have been approved in another document, creating double-claim risk. fNRB method/value also contradict across documents (national default fNRB of 0.38 in recent extract vs earlier local-field or extremely large values), and leakage/ERR contradictions create risk of over- or under-crediting. While the project is not CORSIA-eligible in the latest extract, the contradictory records reduce confidence in safe claims.

Documentation — 2.0 / 10

- many material findings and explicit corrective actions required in the verification report (2026-03-30) indicating incomplete or weak documentation.

- min_extraction_confidence is low and evidence_docs are not clearly listed, lowering the documentation score.

Documentation quality is poor. The verification report (2026-03-30) lists numerous material findings and corrective actions (CARs, CLs, FARs) including unresolved items on baseline, fNRB, and additionality. The dataset reports n_docs_used = 37 but evidence_docs is 'unknown' and min_extraction_confidence is low, indicating key source transparency and extraction issues. Several contradictions are between documents dated 2024–2026, and the most recent verification report was used as the privileged source but extraction confidence remains low.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	tested but weak
● Permanence	reversal risks flagged
● Leakage	inconsistent / unjustified
● Baseline	baseline justification weak
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance noted but questions remain
● Double-claim	CCP-eligible / conflicting status

What Would Improve This Score

→ Resolve all outstanding corrective actions from the 2026 verification report (independent NPV/investment assessment, clear baseline justification, fNRB calculation aligned to TOOL30).

→ Publish clear, consistent primary evidence (monitoring reports, verification appendices) in the registry and ensure full extractable documents to address extraction confidence and contradictions (especially ERR figures, leakage treatment and CCP/CORSIA status).

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation_2673_2025-10-14.pdf
- VCS-IS~1.PDF
- RV1_VCS_2673_PRR_26 April2024.pdf
- VCS_V_PRR_2673_01NOV2022 - 31OCT2024.pdf
- SD_PRR_2673_23AUG2024.pdf
- VCS 2673_NG_Ex-Ante ER_v1.xlsx
- VCS 2673_NG_MR_MP2_v5.4_Round2_clean.pdf
- VCS 2673_NG_ER_MP1 v3.xlsx
- VCS 2673_NG_ER_MP2_v5.3_public.xlsx
- SD-VISta-2673-Monitoring-Report-v2.3_clean.pdf
- VCS_Nigeria_2673_Joint-PDMR_v6-clean.pdf
- Nigeria_SD-VISta-Monitoring-Report v.2_clean.docx
- SD-VISta-2673-Monitoring-Report-v2.0.pdf
- SD-VISta-Monitoring-Report-v1.6-clean.pdf
- SD-VISta-2673-Draft Monitoring-Report-v1.0.pdf
- VCS 2673_Additionality Model v1.1.xlsx
- SD-VISta-Project-Implementaion-Representation-Single-Representor-v1.0.pdf
- VCS 2673 Ex-ante sheet v4.0.xlsx
- SD VISta_PRR_V2_01NOV2022_.31OCT2024pdf.pdf
- Nigeria KML.kml
- VCS-RE~1.PDF
- Nigeria Project KML File.kml
- Project Implementation Deed-UpEnergy Group.pdf
- SD-VISta-Listing-Representation-Single-Representor-v1_Nigeria.pdf
- VCS-Listing-Representation-Single-Representor-v4_Nigeria.pdf
- VCS-2673-PD-v7.4_clean.pdf
- UpEnergy_Nigeria SD-VISta-PD-v1.6-clean.pdf
- VCS-Project-Description-Template-v4.1 - ICE Nigeria Version 3.0 - Clean - 19.05.2022.pdf
- UpEnergy_Nigeria SD-VISta- version 2.0_Clean - 20.05.2022.pdf
- VCS VerR 2673 01112022 - 31102024_round2_clean.pdf
- SD VISta VerR 2673 _Clean.pdf
- Verification Representation_2673_2025-10-29.pdf
- SD VISta ValR 2673 _Clean.pdf
- VCS 2673 Verification-Representation.pdf
- 2673_FVR_v1.3_Clean.pdf
- SD-VISta-Verification-Representation-v1.0_Signed.pdf
- SDVista 2673 VerR 01112022 to 31102024_Round2_clean.pdf
- SD-VISta-Verification-Representation-v1.0.pdf
- SD-VISta-Verification-Representation-v1.0 15-11-2023.pdf
- VCS 2673-Validation-Representation.pdf

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-9672AA2B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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