

QUALITY REPORT

# Native American Methane Capture

CE-native-american-meth · VCS

Report ID: CM-8C5C0B29 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>0.9</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>1.5</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>0.0</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>1.2</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>0.5</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring) cannot be validated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents referenced, the risk of over-crediting and misrepresentation is high by default.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	CE-native-american-meth
Sector	other
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, and MRV
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any reversal/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record

~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying documents

No project design, monitoring, or verification documents were provided in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline validity, leakage treatment, and permanence/reversal provisions cannot be assessed. With no stated baseline method, leakage deduction, or any VVB-confirmed findings, integrity must be scored very conservatively. The absence of any extracted material findings or corrective actions is not reassuring because the underlying reports are missing.

### Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed reductions were found in the extracted record

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

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record includes no evidence documents and no details such as the VVB name, monitoring period, or claimed versus verified emission reductions. MRV quality and registry completeness cannot be evaluated without monitoring/verification reports or registry extracts. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that missing fields are merely omissions rather than unreadable content.

### Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and key over-crediting risk parameters (baseline and leakage justification) were not found in the extracted record

- No cross-checkable ERR figures (claimed vs verified) were available

Claim safety is low because the extracted record does not state CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, baseline approach, or leakage justification—key inputs to assess over-crediting and greenwashing risk. There are also no ERR figures to compare claimed versus verified outcomes. In the absence of substantiating documentation, conservative scoring assumes elevated risk.

### Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero evidence documents were provided/used, so the documentation basis is effectively absent

- Extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability/quality of at least one key source

Documentation is effectively absent: no evidence documents are listed and zero documents were used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable, which further undermines reliability. Given these gaps, this dimension scores near the floor.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment 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>	No safeguards evidence found
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports (including VVB name, monitoring period, and claimed vs verified reductions) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be validated

→ Provide registry extracts showing issuance/retirement history and any CORSIA/CCP eligibility determinations to reduce double-claim and over-crediting 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-8C5C0B29 · 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)