

QUALITY REPORT

2021 Fire Refo

CAR-1957 · CAR · CALIFORNIA, US

Report ID: CM-F68A825E · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	0.3
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.5
	■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record is too sparse to support a strong quality assessment. Key elements such as additionality, baseline method, leakage treatment, buffer pool coverage, and VVB verification are not found in the available documents, so the project carries substantial uncertainty and low claim confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CAR-1957
Sector	arr
Country	CALIFORNIA, US
Vintage	Recent
Crediting Period	2027 — 2053
Monitoring Period	2027 — 2029
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- No additionality test or VVB confirmation is found in the extracted record.
- Baseline, leakage, and permanence safeguards are not stated, and reversal events are marked as not addressed.
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 0.3 / 10

- Additionality is not evidenced in the available documents, and no VVB confirmation is found.
- Baseline method, leakage treatment, buffer pool coverage, and reversal handling are not stated.

The record does not state any additionality test, and there is no evidence that a VVB confirmed additionality. Baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool percentage, and reversal treatment are also not found in the extracted documents, while reversal events are explicitly marked as not addressed. This leaves the integrity assessment very weak.

Transparency — 0.2 / 10

- Only one document was used, and its type is unknown, which limits public traceability and MRV confidence.
- ~ The monitoring period and crediting period are stated, but verified issuance and claimed-versus-verified ERR figures are not available.

Transparency is limited because only one document was used and its type is unknown. The monitoring period and crediting period are provided, but the record does not include a VVB name, claimed-versus-verified ERR totals, or other registry-quality details needed to assess MRV completeness.

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be checked because baseline, leakage, and usage assumptions are not provided.
- ~ Registry is CAR, but CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, leaving dual-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is low because the key inputs needed to judge over-crediting risk are missing: baseline method, leakage justification, and any usage monitoring assumptions are not stated. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not found, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- The evidence base is minimal: one unidentified document and no named VVB.
- ~ Extraction confidence is high, but the underlying documentation remains incomplete and no corrective actions or findings are reported.

Documentation quality is poor despite high extraction confidence, because the evidence base consists of a single unidentified document. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, but that does not offset the absence of named verification, methodology, and safeguard documentation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal handling not addressed
● Leakage	No leakage treatment stated
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	No safeguards documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the full verification and monitoring reports with a named VVB, methodology version, baseline method, and quantified ERR figures.
- Disclose leakage treatment, permanence safeguards such as buffer pool coverage and reversal history, plus CORSIA and CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- listusforest_reforest 2021 Fire Refo v1.1.pdf

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-F68A825E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy