

## QUALITY REPORT

# Clean Bitcoin Primary Market

CC-7 · CAR

Report ID: CM-3F95EA61 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>0.9</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>1.5</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>0.0</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>1.2</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>0.5</b>

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, and MRV results) cannot be substantiated. Given the low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and misleading claims is high.

## Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CC-7
Sector	renewable_energy
Vintage	2023
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring results
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.5 / 10

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

~ Project is labeled as an avoidance renewable energy project, but this cannot be verified without CAR documentation

No official project documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool), and any verification findings cannot be confirmed. The only available context is the user-provided label of an avoidance renewable energy project under CAR, which is insufficient to assess integrity without CAR validation/verification and monitoring evidence.

### Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, registry fields, or verified vs claimed results are available in the extracted record

- With zero documents and low extraction confidence, MRV transparency cannot be assessed

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record includes no documents and therefore no VVB name, monitoring period, or quantified claimed-versus-verified results. Low extraction confidence further suggests that even if documents existed, they were not reliably readable/extracted, limiting confidence in any MRV-related conclusions.

### Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- No evidence is available on baseline setting, leakage justification, or any eligibility status, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk

~ No contradictions were detected, but this is likely because no underlying documents were extracted

Claim safety is low because there is no extracted evidence on baseline setting, leakage justification, or any eligibility/labeling status that would help bound over-crediting or greenwashing risk. With no monitoring/verification outputs available, buyers cannot corroborate whether credited reductions are real and conservatively quantified.

### Documentation — 0.5 / 10

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

- Low extraction confidence suggests poor readability/quality of at least one key source

Documentation is severely deficient: the extracted record shows zero documents used and low extraction confidence. This prevents cross-checking of key CAR elements (validation/verification reports, monitoring reports, and registry issuance details) and triggers the documentation gate risk (documentation below 3 would cap transparency post-scoring).

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality evidence found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	No leakage treatment found
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not found
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards not documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Eligibility/labels not evidenced

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide CAR validation/verification and monitoring reports (with readable text) showing the additionality test, baseline method, leakage assessment, and any findings/corrective actions

→ Provide registry/issuance documentation for CC-7 including monitoring period, credited volume, and claimed-versus-verified results to enable MRV and claim-safety checks

## Documents Reviewed

- Support Document 1

### 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-3F95EA61 · 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)