

QUALITY REPORT

# Protecting Côte d'Ivoire People & Forests

XEP-951383 · Gold Standard

Report ID: CM-3F12C617 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

|                                                              |                       |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| <div>0.9</div> <div>Overall Score</div> <div>out of 10</div> | ■ 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, permanence, and MRV results) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high due to lack of evidence rather than evidence of poor performance.

## Project Details

|             |               |
|-------------|---------------|
| Registry    | Gold Standard |
| Registry ID | XEP-951383    |
| Sector      | other         |
| Vintage     | 2025          |
| Confidence  | Low           |
| Scored      | 2026-04-02    |

## Red Flags

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

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any reversal/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record

~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of source documents

No official documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents used), so additionality testing, baseline method selection, leakage treatment, and any permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool or reversal procedures) are not stated in available documents. With these core elements missing, integrity cannot be substantiated and must be scored very low. The low extraction confidence further increases uncertainty about whether key requirements were met but not readable.

### Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB identity, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed emission reductions were found in the extracted record

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and does not provide a VVB name, monitoring period, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions. Without monitoring/verification details, MRV quality and registry completeness cannot be assessed. Given the absence of public-facing data in the extracted record, the score is conservative.

### Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record

~ Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and leakage assumptions were not available

Claim safety is weak because eligibility and quality labels (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) are not stated in available documents, and there is no information on baseline or leakage assumptions that would allow an over-crediting risk check. With no verified-versus-claimed figures available, there is also no way to test for inflation or inconsistencies in reported results. The score reflects high greenwashing/over-crediting risk driven by lack of evidence.

### Documentation — 0.5 / 10

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

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/availability issues

Documentation is extremely poor: the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents used. In addition, the minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key document was poorly readable, which further undermines reliability. This combination warrants a near-minimum documentation score.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the PDD, latest monitoring report, and latest verification report so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV results can be assessed
- Provide registry and certification status evidence (issuance records, CORSIA eligibility, CCP status) and safeguards documentation (FPIC, grievance mechanism, stakeholder consultation)

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-3F12C617 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy