

QUALITY REPORT

Clean Bitcoin Secondary Market

CC-8 · CAR

Report ID: CM-229A3A7E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.2
	■ 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 attributes (baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV) cannot be substantiated. Given the very low documentation completeness and low extraction confidence, the risk of over-crediting and misleading claims is high.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CC-8
Sector	renewable_energy
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 used), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, and monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability.
- No information found on VVB, monitoring period, ERR verification, leakage treatment, or safeguards.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Baseline approach, additionality assessment, and leakage treatment were not found in the extracted record (no documents available).

~ Project is labeled as an avoidance credit type, but permanence/leakage/baseline details are not substantiated by any cited document.

No project documents were available in the extracted record, so the baseline method, any baseline reassessment timing, and the additionality test (and whether a VVB confirmed it) are not stated in available documents. Leakage treatment (deduction percentage and justification), any buffer pool or reversal provisions, and any material findings/corrective actions are also not found. This creates a high integrity uncertainty consistent with a very low score.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (VVB name, monitoring period, claimed vs verified reductions) were found because no documents were provided.

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed from the extracted record.

Because no monitoring report or verification report is present in the extracted record, the VVB name, monitoring period, and any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions are not stated in available documents. MRV methods (including any usage monitoring or fossil fuel displacement approach) are not found. With low extraction confidence and no documents, transparency is effectively absent.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- Eligibility/status for CCP or CORSIA and any double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record.

- Over-crediting risk cannot be bounded because baseline and verification evidence are missing.

Claim safety cannot be supported because the extracted record contains no evidence on baseline conservativeness, leakage controls, or independent verification outcomes. Status for CCP approval and CORSIA eligibility is not stated in available documents, so double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be ruled out. Given the absence of substantiating documentation, the risk of over-crediting and greenwashing is elevated.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided and zero documents were used in extraction.

- Low extraction confidence reduces trust that key facts were captured even if sources existed.

The extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates that no documents were used, which is a critical documentation gap. In addition, extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source (if any existed) was poorly readable. With no accessible PDD/monitoring/verification materials, documentation quality is extremely weak.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	No baseline method found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CCP/CORSIA status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the CAR project documents (PDD, monitoring report(s), and verification/verification statement) showing baseline selection, additionality test, leakage assessment, and quantified verified emission reductions.

→ Disclose registry and integrity details: VVB identity, monitoring period dates, any material findings/corrective actions, and explicit statements on CCP/CORSIA eligibility and double-claim controls.

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-229A3A7E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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