

QUALITY REPORT

# Protecting Nigeria People & Forests

XEP-5f914f · Gold Standard · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-DB500FE6 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>0.9</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>1.5</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>0.0</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>1.2</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>0.5</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project facts from official documents, and the minimum extraction confidence is low. With no evidence on additionality, baseline setting, leakage, permanence, or MRV results, the project cannot be quality-assessed beyond a very conservative, low score.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	XEP-5f914f
Sector	other
Country	Nigeria
Vintage	2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No official project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used).
- Low readability/low extraction confidence indicates key information may be missing or unreliable.
- No evidence found on additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, or monitoring/verification outcomes.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline method, leakage, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record.
- ~ With no verification/monitoring details available, over-crediting and non-additionality risks cannot be ruled out.

No project design or assurance information was found in the extracted record (no PDD, monitoring report, or verification report listed). As a result, additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage treatment, and permanence/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. Given these evidence gaps, integrity is scored very low by default.

### Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verification results were found in the extracted record.
- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no source documents were provided.

The extracted record contains no public-facing MRV details such as the VVB name, monitoring period, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions. With zero documents used and low extraction confidence, transparency cannot be substantiated and is scored very low.

### Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- No information found on baseline setting, leakage justification, or any eligibility/quality labels (e.g., CORSIA/CCP).
- ~ Without ERR figures or verification outcomes, the risk of over-claiming cannot be evaluated.

No information was found on baseline parameters, leakage justification, or any safeguards against over-crediting. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not stated in available documents, so double-claim/label risk cannot be screened. This creates high greenwashing/over-claiming uncertainty and warrants a low score.

### Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided/used (0 documents).
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing confidence in completeness and accuracy.

No evidence documents were included in the extracted record and the number of documents used is 0. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable or extraction was unreliable. Documentation quality is therefore extremely weak.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Permanence/reversal provisions not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not found
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV outcomes can be assessed.

→ Provide registry/issuance details and any stated CORSIA/CCP status, plus documented safeguards (FPIC, grievance mechanism) to reduce claim and reputational risk.

---

### 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-DB500FE6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)