

QUALITY REPORT

# Hawk Mountain

CE-hawk-mountain-tnc · Cool Effect

Report ID: CM-F508A1AB · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>1.4</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>2.0</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>0.5</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>2.0</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>0.8</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation for Hawk Mountain beyond basic identifiers, so core quality attributes (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high due to lack of evidence rather than evidence of poor performance.

## Project Details

Registry	Cool Effect
Registry ID	CE-hawk-mountain-tnc
Sector	biomass
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the chance of missing or misread critical details.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any reversal/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record (no documents captured).

~ Biomass sector can have material baseline and leakage sensitivities, but these cannot be evaluated without the underlying monitoring/verification documentation.

No project design, baseline methodology, additionality assessment, leakage treatment, or permanence provisions were found in the extracted record, because no evidence documents were captured. Given the biomass classification, these elements are typically central to credit integrity, but cannot be evaluated here. As a result, integrity is scored very low due to unverified fundamentals rather than confirmed deficiencies.

### Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or error/assurance information was found in the extracted record (no documents captured).

- Registry/document completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were provided.

The extracted record contains no verification/monitoring reports, no VVB identification, and no monitoring period information. With no documents available, there is no basis to assess MRV procedures, reported versus verified emission reductions, or registry completeness. Transparency is therefore very weak.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

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

~ Without baseline and leakage details, the risk of overstated climate benefits cannot be bounded.

No information was found on eligibility or quality labels (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status), nor on baseline stringency or leakage justification. In the absence of these core claim-relevant facts, the risk of greenwashing or over-crediting claims cannot be mitigated by evidence. Claim safety is scored low due to inability to substantiate claims.

### Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, leaving major evidence gaps across all quality dimensions.

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability of any absent/implicit information.

The extracted record shows zero evidence documents and indicates low extraction confidence, implying at least one key source was poorly readable. This combination represents a severe documentation gap and materially undermines confidence in any assessment. Documentation is scored near the floor.

## 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 evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the project design document and the latest verification/monitoring reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be assessed.

→ Publish/confirm registry fields and quality labels (VVB name, monitoring period, verified ERs, CORSIA eligibility and CCP status) and ensure documents are machine-readable to avoid low-confidence extraction.

---

### 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-F508A1AB · 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)