QUALITY REPORT

Carbon Credit Collection

CC-2 · Gold Standard · EU ETS

Report ID: CM-57F729FA · 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 MRV) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high by default due to lack of evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CC-2
Sector	industrial
Country	EU ETS
Vintage	2023
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No official documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or incorrect facts.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record due to missing documents.

~ Project is described as avoidance, but permanence/leakage/baseline cannot be assessed without the underlying reports.

No project documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any buffer/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. With no verification/monitoring reports available, there is no evidence on whether any material findings occurred or whether corrective actions were required. Given these evidence gaps, integrity is scored very low.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No registry- or MRV-relevant details (VVB, monitoring period, verified vs claimed reductions) were found because no evidence documents were captured.

- Low extraction confidence reduces confidence that the public record was accurately captured.

The extracted record includes no evidence documents, so key transparency items such as the VVB name, monitoring period, and claimed versus verified emission reductions are not stated in available documents. Minimum extraction confidence is low, which further reduces confidence that the underlying public record (if it exists) was reliably captured. Transparency is therefore scored very low (and would be capped post-scoring if documentation is below the gate threshold).

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and key over-crediting controls (baseline and leakage justification) were not found in the extracted record.

~ Country/region is stated as EU ETS, but this does not substitute for project-level eligibility and accounting evidence.

Without any extracted project documentation, there is no basis to assess over-crediting controls such as baseline selection, leakage justification, or any default factors used. Eligibility indicators such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status are not stated in available documents, increasing greenwashing and double-claim risk by uncertainty. Claim safety is therefore scored very low.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, leaving the assessment unsupported by primary sources.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues even if sources existed.

No evidence documents were provided in the extracted record and the number of documents used is zero, indicating a severe documentation completeness failure. Minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the likelihood of missing critical details. Documentation is scored near the floor.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	No additionality evidence found
● **Permanence**	Avoidance type but not evidenced
● **Leakage**	No leakage treatment found
● **Baseline**	No baseline method found
● **Safeguards**	No safeguards evidence found
● **Double-claim**	Eligibility/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the Gold Standard PDD, validation/verification reports, and the latest monitoring report so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be evidenced and cross-checked.

→ Provide registry extracts (issuance/retirement records) and explicit statements on CORSIA eligibility and CCP status to reduce double-claim and greenwashing risk.

Documents Reviewed

• Support Document 1

Report ID: CM-57F729FA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy