

QUALITY REPORT

Clean Solar Electricity for Mauritius

XEP-f87099 · Verra

Report ID: CM-4E76E71E · 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 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 practice.

Project Details

Registry	Verra
Registry ID	XEP-f87099
Sector	other
Vintage	2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or mis-extracted critical information.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

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

~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying sources.

No official documents were captured in the extracted record, so the project's additionality demonstration, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal considerations are not stated in available documents. Without a monitoring report or verification report, there is no evidence on whether any material findings or corrective actions occurred. Given these evidence gaps, integrity is scored very low as the core determinants of credit quality cannot be substantiated.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB identity, monitoring period, or quantified monitoring/verification results were found in the extracted record.

- Registry- and MRV-relevant fields (e.g., eligibility and error checks) are not evidenced because no documents were captured.

The extracted record contains no monitoring/verification documentation, so key transparency items such as the VVB name, monitoring period, and any cross-checks between claimed and verified emission reductions are not found. Public-data completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents are listed. Transparency is therefore very weak due to absence of MRV and registry-completeness evidence.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record, so downstream claim risk cannot be screened.

~ Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and monitoring assumptions are not evidenced.

No information was found on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, baseline parameters, or leakage justification, so the risk of over-crediting and problematic marketing claims cannot be screened. With no extracted verification outcomes, there is also no evidence that claimed results were independently confirmed. Claim safety is scored low because the record does not support defensible claims.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, indicating a major evidence gap.

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability and completeness of any potential document-derived facts.

The extracted record shows 0 documents used and low extraction confidence, indicating severe documentation incompleteness and potential unreadability of key sources. With no listed evidence documents, independence of validation/verification and recency of monitoring cannot be checked. Documentation is therefore scored near the floor.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, validation report, monitoring report(s), and verification report(s) so additionality, baseline selection, leakage, and MRV results can be assessed.

→ Publish or supply registry and eligibility information (e.g., VVB identity, monitoring periods, claimed vs verified ERs, and any CORSIA/CCP status) to reduce claim and double-claim 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-4E76E71E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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