

QUALITY REPORT

Graze a Trail

CE-graze-a-trail · Verra · Mexico

Report ID: CM-986C8442 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.3

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
■ 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, and key quality determinants (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV) are not stated in available documents. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and unreliable claims is high.

Project Details

Registry	Verra
Registry ID	CE-graze-a-trail
Sector	other
Country	Mexico
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), so baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring cannot be validated
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record (no documents available)

~ Removal project type implies permanence and leakage are material, but neither is evidenced in the available record

No project design, monitoring, or verification documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions are not stated in available documents. For a removal project, lack of evidence on reversal risk management (e.g., buffer pool or other safeguards) is a major integrity gap. With no VVB findings or corrective actions available, there is no basis to judge whether the credited removals are robust.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or MRV details were found in the extracted record (no documents available)

- Registry- and reporting-level details (e.g., ERR claimed vs verified) were not found in the extracted record

Transparency is very weak because no VVB name, monitoring period, or quantified results (e.g., claimed vs verified removals) were found in the extracted record. The absence of any listed evidence documents prevents independent review of MRV procedures or registry completeness. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the public record is complete and readable.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be assessed because baseline and monitoring methods were not found in the extracted record

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty around downstream claim risk

Claim safety is low because the extracted record provides no baseline method, leakage justification, or monitoring approach, making over-crediting risk impossible to bound. Eligibility or quality labels that affect claims (e.g., CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) are not stated in available documents, increasing uncertainty for buyers. With no verified figures available, there is no way to reconcile claimed versus verified outcomes.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- No evidence documents were captured (0 documents used), so the project is not auditable from the extracted record

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates low extraction confidence. Without a PDD, monitoring report, or verification report in the record, the project cannot be assessed for conformance, recency, or auditor independence. This also implies a high likelihood of missing key disclosures (methods, data, findings).

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	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and link core documents (PDD, monitoring report(s), verification report(s)) and ensure they are machine-readable to resolve the low extraction confidence

→ Disclose and evidence baseline selection, additionality test, leakage assessment/deduction, and permanence/reversal risk management (e.g., buffer pool or equivalent), including VVB conclusions and any corrective actions

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-986C8442 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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