

QUALITY REPORT

Powering Senegal with Solar energy

XEP-c642e5 · Verra · Senegal

Report ID: CM-6DE0E482 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ 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, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring) cannot be assessed. 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-c642e5
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Senegal
Vintage	2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing assessment of additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable or not reliably extracted

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions are not found in the extracted record

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

No project design or assurance information is available in the extracted record: there are no documents to confirm additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage assessment, buffer/reversal provisions, or whether any material findings/corrective actions occurred. Because these elements are not stated in available documents, integrity must be scored conservatively.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB identity, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed reductions are available in the extracted record

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

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record includes no verification/monitoring reports, no VVB name, and no monitoring period or quantified claimed vs verified reductions. With no evidence documents captured, MRV quality and registry completeness cannot be substantiated.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and key over-crediting risk parameters (baseline and leakage justification) are not found in the extracted record

~ No contradictions in emissions reduction figures are listed, but no figures are available to cross-check

Claim safety is weak due to missing information needed to judge over-crediting and eligibility risks, including baseline approach, leakage justification, and any CORSIA/CCP status. The extracted record provides no emissions reduction figures to check for internal consistency or inflation risk.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

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

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing reliability of any missing/partial data

Documentation is extremely poor: the extracted record shows zero documents used and no evidence documents listed, and the minimum extraction confidence is low. This combination indicates a high likelihood that key information is missing or could not be reliably extracted.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the most recent verification and monitoring reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be evaluated

→ Provide registry/issuance details including VVB name, monitoring period, claimed vs verified reductions, and any CORSIA/CCP eligibility statements

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-6DE0E482 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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