

QUALITY REPORT

Cup of the Community

CE-cup-of-the-community · CAR · Mexico

Report ID: CM-70E7D052 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.5
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, and at least one key source was poorly readable. As a result, core quality determinants (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV performance) cannot be substantiated, creating a high risk of over-crediting and weak defensibility of claims.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CE-cup-of-the-community
Sector	redd
Country	Mexico
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability of any missing/partial information.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and reversal/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record because no documents were available.

~ The project is described as REDD/removal, but permanence and leakage risks cannot be evaluated without monitoring/verification evidence.

No validation/verification, monitoring, or PDD content was available in the extracted record (no evidence documents listed), so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions (buffer pool or reversal handling) are not stated in available documents. Given the project is described as REDD/removal, these missing elements are material to integrity and create a high uncertainty of credit quality. The low extraction confidence further increases the chance that critical integrity details were not reliably captured.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB identity, monitoring period, or quantified claimed vs verified removals were found in the extracted record due to missing documents.

- Registry completeness cannot be assessed because no supporting documentation was captured.

The extracted record contains no VVB name, monitoring period, or any quantified comparison of claimed versus verified removals because no documents were available. Without monitoring/verification reports or registry-linked documentation, MRV quality and public transparency cannot be substantiated. Low extraction confidence also reduces confidence that transparency-related details were captured even if present in source files.

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and any safeguards against over-crediting were not found in the extracted record.

~ With no baseline and leakage information available, the risk of over-crediting cannot be bounded.

No information was found in the extracted record on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, baseline conservativeness, or leakage justification, all of which are important to assess greenwashing and over-crediting risk. For a REDD/removal project, the absence of permanence and leakage evidence elevates claim risk because reversals and displacement can materially affect net climate benefit. With no documents, the project's claims cannot be defended from the extracted evidence.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided in the extracted record (0 documents used).

- Low extraction confidence suggests at least one key document was poorly readable, reducing evidentiary strength.

Documentation is extremely weak: the extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates low extraction confidence. This means the assessment cannot rely on any official project documents (e.g., PDD, monitoring report, verification report) to substantiate key facts. The lack of documents is itself a critical deficiency for credit quality evaluation.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the CAR project design/registration documentation and the most recent monitoring and verification reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence/buffer, and quantified verified removals can be assessed.

→ Provide registry-linked evidence of issuance/retirement, VVB identity, and any CORSIA/CCP eligibility determinations, plus documented safeguards (FPIC, grievance mechanism) to reduce claim and reputational risk.

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-70E7D052 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy