

## QUALITY REPORT

# Moss Carbon Credit MCO2

CC-4 · Verra VCS

Report ID: CM-22675586 · 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, so core quality attributes (additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV performance) cannot be substantiated. Given the low readability flag and zero documents captured, the project should be treated as high uncertainty and high over-crediting/greenwashing risk until primary sources are reviewed.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra VCS
Registry ID	CC-4
Sector	other
Vintage	2023
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

■ No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring claims

■ Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or misread critical details

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions are not found in the extracted record because no documents were available

~ The project is described as an avoidance credit type, but permanence, leakage, and baseline integrity cannot be assessed without source documents

No project documents were captured in the extracted record (evidence document list is empty), so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool or reversal reporting) are not stated in available documents. With no verification/monitoring reports available, it is also not possible to confirm whether any material findings or corrective actions occurred. This results in a very low integrity score driven by evidence gaps rather than confirmed deficiencies.

### Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or MRV error checks are available in the extracted record due to missing documents

- Registry completeness and eligibility indicators (e.g., CORSIA/CCP) are not found in the extracted record

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no documents and therefore no VVB identity, monitoring period, or quantified MRV checks (e.g., claimed vs verified emission reductions). Registry-relevant fields such as eligibility indicators are also not found in the extracted record. The low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that key transparency details were missed.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline method, leakage justification, and any default factors are not found in the extracted record

~ Double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be screened because CORSIA/CCP status is not found in the extracted record

Claim safety is weak because the extracted record provides no basis to assess over-crediting controls (baseline selection, reassessment timing, leakage deductions/justification, or usage monitoring assumptions). Eligibility and double-claim risk screening cannot be completed because CORSIA/CCP status is not found in the extracted record. In the absence of evidence, conservative scoring is applied to reflect elevated greenwashing risk.

### Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided (0 documents used), indicating severe documentation gaps

- Low extraction confidence suggests the underlying source(s) were poorly readable, reducing reliability even if documents exist elsewhere

Documentation quality is extremely poor: zero documents were used and the evidence document list is empty, indicating that core project records (PDD, monitoring reports, verification reports) were not available in the extracted record. Minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key document was poorly readable and reducing confidence in completeness. This triggers the documentation gate risk (documentation below 3.0 would cap transparency post-scoring).

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not found
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards not evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and link the core VCS documents (PDD, monitoring report(s), verification report(s), and issuance/registry pages) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be independently checked

→ Improve document readability/scan quality and re-extract key fields (VVB, monitoring period, claimed vs verified ERs, leakage deduction/justification, and any findings/corrective actions) to resolve the low extraction confidence

### 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-22675586 · 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)