

QUALITY REPORT

Gas Buster

ACR-893 · ACR · Germany

Report ID: CM-048EDEE6 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.5
	■ 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 performance) 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	American Carbon Registry (ACR)
Registry ID	ACR-893
Sector	other
Country	Germany
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV.
- 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 documents).

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

No official project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), so additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage treatment, and any permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool or reversal procedures) are not stated in available documents. With these core integrity elements missing, the project cannot be assessed for robustness and is scored very low by default. The low extraction confidence further increases the chance that key integrity details were not reliably captured.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

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

- Registry-relevant completeness (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status, MRV methods) cannot be assessed without documents.

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and therefore no verifiable information on the VVB, monitoring period, MRV approach, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions. Registry completeness items such as CORSIA eligibility are also not stated in available documents. Given documentation below 3.0, a transparency cap may apply under the stated gate rules (applied after scoring).

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and leakage assumptions are not available in the extracted record.

~ CORSIA/CCP eligibility and double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for end-user claims.

Claim safety is weak because there is no extracted evidence on baseline setting, leakage justification/deductions, or verification outcomes—key determinants of over-crediting risk. CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot confidently make higher-integrity claims tied to those frameworks. The score reflects uncertainty and the inability to substantiate claims rather than a confirmed deficiency in project performance.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were captured/used in extraction, leaving the assessment evidence-free.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues that further undermine reliability.

Documentation quality is extremely poor in the extracted record: no evidence documents were captured and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable. Without any listed reports (PDD, validation/verification, monitoring), independence, recency, and corrective actions cannot be evaluated. This drives a very low documentation score and reduces confidence in all other dimensions.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the full set of official documents (PDD, validation/verification reports, monitoring reports, and registry issuance/retirement records) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be substantiated.
- Improve document legibility/extraction quality (higher-confidence OCR or source PDFs) and include explicit statements on CORSIA/CCP status and any corrective actions/material findings.

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-048EDEE6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy