

QUALITY REPORT

KLIMA DAO

CC-5 · CAR

Report ID: CM-BA7776DA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality determinants (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV results) cannot be assessed. With low extraction confidence and zero documents used, the risk of over-crediting and misleading claims is high due to lack of evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CC-5
Sector	other
Vintage	2023
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No official project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing assessment of additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.2 / 10

- No evidence found in the extracted record for additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, buffer pool, or reversals

- ~ Sector is listed as “other,” but without documents the applicability of key integrity tests cannot be determined

No project documents were available in the extracted record (no evidence documents listed and 0 documents used), so additionality, baseline validity, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool or reversal reporting) are not stated in available documents. Given these evidence gaps, integrity cannot be substantiated and is scored very low.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No public-facing MRV details (monitoring period, VVB, ERR claimed/verified) found in the extracted record

- Registry completeness cannot be evaluated because no documentation was provided

Because no documents were extracted, key transparency items such as the VVB name, monitoring period, and any comparison of claimed versus verified emissions reductions are not found in the extracted record. Low extraction confidence further undermines the ability to rely on any missing or partial information, so transparency is scored near the floor (noting the post-scoring cap rule if documentation is below 3.0).

Claim Safety — 1.0 / 10

- No evidence found for baseline approach, leakage justification, or verified performance, increasing over-crediting/greenwashing risk

- ~ CCP/CORSIA status not found in the extracted record, so double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be screened

With no stated baseline method, leakage justification, or verified results in the extracted record, there is no basis to judge over-crediting risk or the defensibility of claims. Eligibility signals (e.g., CCP status or CORSIA eligibility) are also not found in the extracted record, so double-claim/market-eligibility risk cannot be screened and claim safety remains very low.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero documents listed/used in the extracted record

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability of at least one key source

The extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents used, which is insufficient to support any quality assessment. The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing documentation quality and reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not documented
● Double-claim	Eligibility/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the CAR project documents (PDD, monitoring report(s), and verification/validation report(s)) including baseline method, additionality test, leakage assessment, and any permanence/buffer provisions
- Publish registry and MRV details (VVB name, monitoring periods, claimed vs verified ERs, and any corrective actions/material findings) and clarify CCP/CORSIA eligibility status

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-BA7776DA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy