

QUALITY REPORT

Using Biomass Residues to Power Brick Production

XEP-521764 · Verra

Report ID: CM-0385429C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|-----------------------|------------|
| ■ Integrity (35%) | 2.2 |
| ■ 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

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation beyond basic metadata, so core quality determinants (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring results) cannot be validated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak substantiation is high based on evidence gaps alone.

Project Details

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Registry | Verra |
| Registry ID | XEP-521764 |
| Sector | biomass |
| Vintage | 2025 |
| Confidence | Low |
| Scored | 2026-04-02 |

Red Flags

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

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.2 / 10

- Additionality approach, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any nonconformities are not stated in the extracted record (no documents available)

~ Biomass residue fuel-switch projects can be credible in principle, but this cannot be assessed without the PDD/monitoring/verification evidence

No project design or assurance documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage assessment, and any permanence/reversal considerations are not stated in available documents. Because there is no verification/monitoring evidence in the extracted record, it is not possible to confirm whether any material findings occurred or whether corrective actions were required. Given these evidence gaps, integrity is scored very low and conservatively.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

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

- Registry/documentation completeness is effectively absent in the extracted record (0 documents; low readability)

The extracted record does not include a VVB name, monitoring period, or any claimed versus verified emission reductions, so MRV transparency cannot be evaluated. With no documents available and low extraction confidence, the project's public traceability and registry completeness cannot be substantiated from the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline and monitoring assumptions/results are not stated in the extracted record

~ CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unresolved

Key claim-safety checks—such as whether the baseline is conservative, whether leakage is justified/quantified, and whether monitored fuel use and emission factors were independently verified—are not stated in the extracted record. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not stated, so eligibility-related marketing and double-claim risk cannot be screened and remains uncertain.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

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

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

The extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates low extraction confidence, implying that either documents were not available or could not be reliably read/parsed. This prevents independent replication of calculations and verification of audit conclusions, so documentation quality is scored near the floor. Note: per the gate rules, a documentation score below 3.0 would cap transparency after scoring.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| ● Additionality | No additionality assessment found in extracted record |
| ● Permanence | Reversal/permanence provisions not evidenced |
| ● Leakage | No leakage treatment found in extracted record |
| ● Baseline | Baseline method not stated in extracted record |
| ● Safeguards | No safeguards/FPIC/grievance evidence found |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA/CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide/parse the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, and verified ERs can be independently checked

→ Disclose registry details and assurance information (VVB name, monitoring period, claimed vs verified ERs, any findings/corrective actions) and improve document readability to raise 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-0385429C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy