

QUALITY REPORT

California Hydro Q4 2022 RECs

CC-20 · I-REC · United States

Report ID: CM-058AB5A6 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.6

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.2
■ Transparency (25%)	0.8
■ 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, so core quality elements (baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV) cannot be substantiated. Given the low readability flag and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting or misrepresentation cannot be screened and should be treated as high until primary documents are provided.

Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	CC-20
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	United States
Vintage	2022
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

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

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.2 / 10

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

~ Renewable energy avoidance claims can be robust, but this cannot be confirmed without the I-REC evidence pack and verification/issuance records.

No official documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), so the baseline method, additionality assessment, leakage approach, and any permanence/reversal provisions were not stated in available documents. With no verification or monitoring reports captured, there is no basis to confirm that credited MWh are additional or correctly quantified. Given these evidence gaps, integrity must be scored very low pending provision of the I-REC project registration and issuance documentation.

Transparency — 0.8 / 10

- No public-facing MRV details (monitoring period, verifier, errors, or issuance data) were found in the extracted record.

- Registry completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were provided.

Transparency is weak because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and therefore no monitoring period, metering/QA procedures, verifier identity, or error checks. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating that even if documents were present, key details may not have been reliably captured. As a result, the project cannot be independently reviewed from the provided record.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting/greenwashing risk cannot be screened because baseline and eligibility/claiming constraints were not found in the extracted record.

~ The label 'RECs' suggests an attribute certificate context, but without I-REC issuance and ownership/retirement evidence, double-claim risk remains unresolved.

Claim safety is low because the extracted record does not include any information on how environmental attributes are uniquely claimed (e.g., ownership chain and retirement) or any constraints on claims. No baseline or grid emission factor approach was found in the extracted record, so over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated. Without registry/retirement evidence, the risk of double claiming remains unresolved.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, so the project file is effectively non-auditable from the provided record.

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability even if documents existed outside the extracted record.

Documentation is very poor: the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents used. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the record reflects the underlying project file. This prevents assessment of VVB independence, recency, and whether any corrective actions were required.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment 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/retirement status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the I-REC project registration record and issuance/retirement certificates for Q4 2022, including plant ID, production period, and beneficiary/retirement details.

→ Provide the metering and verification/assurance documentation (e.g., auditor/VVB statement, data QA/QC, and any non-conformities/corrective actions) to substantiate MRV and prevent double-claiming.

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-058AB5A6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy