

QUALITY REPORT

# Buried Treasure

CAR-1696 · CAR · Mexico

Report ID: CM-7A8D35A2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>5.8</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.2</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>6.1</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>6.0</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.4</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The verification report (2023) indicates the project was verified by SCS Global Services with no material findings or corrective actions, which supports basic credibility. However, key integrity-critical details—baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any permanence/buffer provisions—were not found in the extracted record, creating meaningful uncertainty about over-crediting risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CAR-1696
Sector	other
Country	Mexico
Vintage	Aging
VVB	SCS Global Services
Verified ERs	104,927 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual emissions estimate.
- Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) was not found in the extracted record.
- Permanence/reversal risk management (e.g., buffer pool contribution or reversal provisions) was not found in the extracted record.
- Safeguards are weakly evidenced: FPIC not conducted and no grievance mechanism reported.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The verification report (2023) indicates additionality was verified by the VVB and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline method, leakage treatment, and permanence/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting uncertainty.

The verification report (2023) indicates additionality was verified by SCS Global Services and reports no material findings or corrective actions, which supports procedural integrity. However, the baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, making it hard to judge whether the counterfactual is conservative. Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) and permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool or reversal handling) were also not found in the extracted record, so integrity is scored mid-range with a conservative penalty for missing core details.

### Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ The verification report (2023) provides a clear monitoring period (2021-11-30 to 2022-11-29) and a verified ER total of 104,927.

- The extracted record lacks key quantified MRV elements (e.g., claimed vs verified comparison, baseline parameters), limiting auditability.

The verification report (2023) clearly states the monitoring period (2021-11-30—2022-11-29) and provides a verified total of 104,927 emission reductions. No claimed total was found in the extracted record, preventing a straightforward claimed-versus-verified comparison. Several key methodological and parameter details (baseline approach, leakage, and other calculation inputs) were not found in the extracted record, reducing transparency and reproducibility.

### Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing certain double-claiming/dual-eligibility concerns.

- CCP status and core over-crediting drivers (baseline and leakage) were not found in the extracted record, elevating greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

The extracted record states the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers certain risks of high-profile compliance claims. At the same time, CCP status was not found in the extracted record, and the main drivers of over-crediting risk—baseline method and leakage treatment—were also not found. Given these evidence gaps, the project is moderately safe to claim only with careful qualification and avoidance of strong “high-integrity” assertions.

### Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ High extraction confidence and an identified VVB (SCS Global Services) with a dated verification report (2023-12-16).

- Only two documents were used and one is listed as unknown, with several critical fields not found in the extracted record.

Documentation quality is moderate: the extracted record includes a dated verification report (2023-12-16), identifies the VVB (SCS Global Services), and extraction confidence is high. However, only two documents were used and one is labeled unknown, and multiple critical fields (baseline, leakage, permanence/buffer) were not found in the extracted record. The absence of corrective actions in the verification report (2023) is positive, but completeness remains a constraint.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-verified additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not evidenced
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the baseline approach and key baseline parameters from the protocol application (and any baseline reassessment timing) so the counterfactual can be independently checked.

→ Disclose leakage assessment details (justification and any deduction) and any permanence/reversal risk management provisions (e.g., buffer pool or reversal procedures) applicable under the CAR landfill protocol.

## Documents Reviewed

- Project Submittal Form
- Project Verification

### 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-7A8D35A2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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