

QUALITY REPORT

Grass Is Greener

CAR-1247 · CAR · Montana

Report ID: CM-99BAFFB1 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.2

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

Assessment Summary

This CAR avoided grassland conversion project has a recent verification report with no material findings and no reversals reported for the monitoring period. However, key integrity parameters (baseline approach, leakage treatment, and buffer/pooling details) are not stated in the extracted record, which increases over-crediting risk and reduces confidence in claims.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CAR-1247
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Montana
Vintage	Stale
Crediting Period	2016 — 2066
VVB	Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record.
- Leakage is explicitly not addressed, and no leakage deduction is provided.
- Buffer pool contribution (or equivalent permanence risk management) is not stated in available documents.
- Safeguards documentation is inconsistent across documents (mentioned in the verification report but not in an earlier document).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The verification report (2021-08-27) confirms additionality and reports no material findings or corrective actions.
- Leakage is not addressed and key baseline/permanence parameters (baseline method, buffer contribution) are not stated in the extracted record.

The verification report (2021-08-27) confirms additionality and reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports basic program integrity. Permanence risk appears managed in practice for the period (no reversals reported), but the buffer pool contribution (or equivalent risk management terms) is not stated in the extracted record. Baseline approach and reassessment timing are also not stated, and leakage is explicitly not addressed with no deduction reported, which weakens confidence in net climate benefit.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The VVB is identified (Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2020-06-16 to 2021-06-15) in the verification report (2021-08-27).
- Claimed vs. verified ERs are not provided in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

The verification report (2021-08-27) clearly identifies the VVB (Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.) and specifies the monitoring period (2020-06-16—2021-06-15). However, the extracted record does not include the total emissions reductions/removals claimed or verified, preventing a basic cross-check of accounting outcomes. With limited document coverage (two documents, one unspecified), public traceability of key quantifications is constrained.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

- + No reversals were reported during the reporting period in the verification report (2021-08-27).
- CORSIA/CCP status is not stated and leakage/baseline details are missing, increasing greenwashing and over-crediting risk.

Because baseline method and leakage treatment are not substantiated in the extracted record (and leakage is noted as not addressed), there is elevated risk that credited benefits could be overstated. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so buyers cannot easily assess whether the credits might be used in multiple claim contexts. The verification report (2021-08-27) indicates no reversals during the period, which helps, but does not resolve the over-crediting uncertainties.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

- + A recent verification report (2021-08-27) is available with high extraction confidence and no corrective actions required.
- Only two documents were captured (one is an unknown document), and safeguards information is contradictory across sources.

Documentation quality is moderate: there is a recent verification report dated 2021-08-27 and extraction confidence is high. Still, only two documents were used and one is labeled unknown, suggesting incomplete coverage of foundational items like baseline and leakage sections. The absence of corrective actions in the verification report supports document completeness for that period, but contradictions and missing core parameters reduce overall documentation strength.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality confirmed by VVB
● Permanence	No reversals reported, but buffer terms not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Disclose the baseline approach used under the Grassland Project Protocol V1.0 and when it was last reassessed, with clear citations to the governing document sections.
- Provide quantified leakage assessment (or a justified negligible leakage determination) and the applied leakage deduction, if any.
- Publish/confirm permanence risk management details, including buffer pool contribution percentage and any reversal risk mitigation requirements.

Documents Reviewed

- Project Submittal Form
- Verification Report

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-99BAFFB1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](#) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](#) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](#)