

QUALITY REPORT

Home of the Raptors

CE-hawk-mountain · Cool Effect

Report ID: CM-A13CA32D · 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%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

Very little project information was found in the extracted record, and no official documents were available to substantiate baseline setting, additionality, leakage, or monitoring. With low extraction confidence and zero usable documents, the risk of over-crediting and unreliable claims is high.

Project Details

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

Red Flags

- No official project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV
- 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 permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record due to missing documentation

~ Sector is listed as biomass, but without methodology and monitoring details the over-crediting risk cannot be bounded

No project design or verification content was available in the extracted record (no evidence documents listed), so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage assessment, and permanence/reversal provisions could not be confirmed. Given the biomass sector classification, these elements are typically material to credit integrity, but they were not stated in available documents. This warrants a very low integrity score due to unbounded over-crediting risk.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or verification/issuance details were found in the extracted record

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were provided

Transparency is very weak because no monitoring period, MRV approach, VVB identity, or verification outcomes were found in the extracted record. With zero documents used, there is no way to cross-check claimed versus verified emission reductions or assess registry completeness. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that missing items are merely extraction artifacts rather than true disclosure gaps.

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- No information found on baseline method, leakage justification, or eligibility statuses (e.g., CORSIA/CCP), increasing greenwashing and over-crediting risk

~ Without ERR claim/verification figures, it is not possible to check for internal consistency or conservative accounting

Claim safety is low because there is no evidence in the extracted record about baseline conservativeness, leakage deductions, or any eligibility/labeling status (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval). Without these, buyers cannot reliably assess whether credits are likely to be overstated or marketed with unsupported claims. The absence of any quantified results also prevents basic plausibility checks.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

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

- Low extraction confidence suggests the underlying source material (if any) was not reliably readable

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record shows zero documents used and low extraction confidence. This means key claims cannot be traced to official sources (PDD, monitoring report, verification report, etc.). As a result, the project is not auditable from the provided record.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the core document set (PDD, monitoring report(s), verification report(s), and registry issuance/retirement records) so baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV can be audited

→ Improve document legibility/availability (address low extraction confidence) and include quantified results (claimed vs verified ERs) plus eligibility/labeling statements (e.g., CORSIA/CCP) to reduce claim 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-A13CA32D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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