

QUALITY REPORT

Nitrous Oxide Abatement

CAR-768 · CAR

Report ID: CM-415CF18E · 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 beyond basic identifiers, so core quality determinants (baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring results) cannot be verified. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting or misinterpretation is high and the project cannot be robustly assessed from the available evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CAR-768
Sector	methane
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, monitoring, and issuance details
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or incorrect critical facts

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any reversals are not stated in available documents
- ~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying evidence

No project design document, monitoring report, or verification report was captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any corrective actions or material findings cannot be confirmed. Because these are core integrity determinants for an abatement project, the integrity score is heavily penalized for evidence gaps. Low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that key integrity-relevant details were missed.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified emissions reductions are available in the extracted record
- Registry completeness cannot be checked because no evidence documents were captured

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record contains no public-facing documentation artifacts (no evidence documents listed and zero documents used). Without a verification body name, monitoring period, or claimed versus verified reductions, MRV quality and registry completeness cannot be assessed. Low extraction confidence also reduces confidence that the absence of these details reflects true non-disclosure rather than extraction failure.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and any safeguards against over-crediting are not stated in available documents
- ~ Project type and sector labeling appear inconsistent (nitrous oxide abatement vs methane sector), but no documents are available to resolve this

Claim safety is limited by the inability to verify baseline conservativeness, leakage handling, and whether credits align with any relevant eligibility frameworks. The extracted record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so buyers cannot gauge double-claiming or eligibility-related greenwashing risk. The mismatch between the stated project type (nitrous oxide abatement) and sector classification (methane) cannot be resolved without documents, adding uncertainty.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used and no evidence documents are listed
- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability of any missing/unstated fields

Documentation quality is extremely poor: no evidence documents are listed, and the extraction indicates zero documents were used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source was poorly readable, which materially undermines completeness and reliability. This score is intentionally very low because the assessment cannot be substantiated from the provided record.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the project design document and the applicable CAR protocol/method reference, including the baseline approach and additionality demonstration
- Provide the latest monitoring report and verification statement showing the monitoring period, claimed vs verified reductions, any findings/corrective actions, and leakage treatment

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-415CF18E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy