

QUALITY REPORT

Protecting DRC Communities & Forests

XEP-7619a6 · Gold Standard · Drc

Report ID: CM-E22B86D6 · 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 attributes (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and misleading claims is high due to lack of verifiable evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	XEP-7619a6
Sector	other
Country	Drc
Vintage	2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

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

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record due to missing documents.

~ With no extracted monitoring/verification findings, integrity risks cannot be bounded and should be treated conservatively.

No validation/verification, PDD, or monitoring report content was found in the extracted record (no evidence documents captured), so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and any permanence provisions cannot be confirmed. Given these evidence gaps, integrity must be scored very low because the project's core accounting assumptions are unsubstantiated.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or quantified results were found in the extracted record because no evidence documents were captured.

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed from the extracted record (0 documents used).

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record contains no documents and therefore no VVB identity, monitoring period, or reported/verified results to review. Low extraction confidence further undermines the ability to rely on any missing or partially captured disclosures.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- Eligibility/status signals (e.g., CORSIA/CCP) and over-crediting risk controls were not found in the extracted record.

~ With no ERR figures or baseline parameters available, claims cannot be checked for consistency and should be treated as high risk.

Claim safety is low because the extracted record provides no basis to assess over-crediting controls (baseline parameters, leakage deductions, usage monitoring, or error rates) and no information on CCP/CORSIA-related status. In the absence of substantiating evidence, public claims should be treated as high greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents used).

- Low extraction confidence suggests poor readability/quality of at least one key source, reducing evidentiary value.

Documentation is effectively absent: the extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence list. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable, which further reduces confidence in completeness and accuracy.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	No baseline method found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full set of official documents (PDD, validation/verification reports, monitoring reports, and registry issuance records) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be independently checked.

→ Improve document legibility/scan quality and ensure key quantitative tables (baseline parameters, leakage deductions, monitoring results, and any findings/corrective actions) are machine-readable 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-E22B86D6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy