

## QUALITY REPORT

# Take a Hike

CE-take-a-hike-tn · CAR · Tennessee

Report ID: CM-FEE7F5FC · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>6.0</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.2</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.4</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.8</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>7.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is an improved forest management project with VVB-confirmed additionality and an 18% buffer contribution, and no reversals reported for the monitoring period. However, several internal inconsistencies across documents—especially the leakage deduction (0.4% vs 40%) and safeguards/FPIC/grievance statements—reduce confidence in the reliability of key quality claims.

## Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CE-take-a-hike-tn
Sector	arr
Country	Tennessee
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Improved Forest Management Methodology for Quantifying GHG Removals and Emission Reductions through Increased Forest Carbon Sequestration on Non-Federal U.S. Forestlands 1.3
Crediting Period	2018 — 2038
VVB	Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Major discrepancy in leakage deduction between the monitoring report (0.4%) and the validation report (40%), which can materially affect credited ERs
- Safeguards-related statements conflict across documents (FPIC, grievance mechanism, and whether safeguards are mentioned), increasing social-risk and reputational risk
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record
- Total ERs claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record, limiting independent reasonableness checks

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB and no reversals were reported for the monitoring period (validation/monitoring documentation).

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (0.4% vs 40%), and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record.

The validation documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier-type assessment, supporting additionality robustness. The monitoring report (2019) states there were no intentional or unintentional reversals during the reporting period and the project contributes 18% to the buffer pool, which supports permanence risk management. Integrity is weakened by a major inconsistency in leakage: the monitoring report quantifies leakage at 0.4%, while the validation report (2020-05-06) indicates 40%, and the baseline is project-specific with no baseline reassessment timing found in the extracted record.

### Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ VVB is identified (Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2018-12-06 to 2019-12-05).

- Total emission reductions claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record, and key MRV cross-checks are therefore limited.

The monitoring period is clearly specified (2018-12-06—2019-12-05) and the VVB is named (Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc), which supports traceability. However, the extracted record does not include total emission reductions claimed or verified, limiting the ability to reconcile issuance quantities to monitoring results. Conflicting statements across documents on safeguards-related items also reduce transparency because readers cannot easily determine which commitments actually apply.

### Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing dual-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by the unresolved leakage discrepancy (0.4% vs 40%) and conflicting safeguard disclosures.

The project is explicitly stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of claims being made simultaneously into CORSIA-related channels. Claim safety is nevertheless constrained by potential over-crediting risk from the unresolved leakage discrepancy (0.4% in the monitoring report versus 40% in the validation report), which could materially change net credited reductions. In addition, conflicting disclosures on FPIC, safeguards, and grievance mechanisms increase reputational and stakeholder-risk for downstream claims.

### Documentation — 7.1 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are present (PDD, monitoring report, validation report) and extraction confidence is high.

- Contradictions across documents on several key fields (leakage, FPIC, grievance mechanism, safeguards) indicate documentation reliability issues.

The extracted record includes a PDD, monitoring report, and validation report, with high extraction confidence and no material findings or corrective actions reported, which supports documentation completeness. Still, multiple contradictions across documents (FPIC, benefit sharing, safeguards mention, grievance mechanism, leakage percentage, and how reversals are addressed) indicate internal inconsistency that reduces confidence in the documentary record. The crediting period is long (2018-06-05—2038-06-04) while the monitoring evidence shown is for an early one-year period, so ongoing documentation quality will matter for future periods.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Buffer pool (18%) and no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified but conflicting leakage deduction
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistently documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Resolve and document the leakage deduction discrepancy (0.4% vs 40%) with a clear calculation trail and reconcile net ERs/issuance accordingly.

→ Publish consistent, auditable safeguards evidence (FPIC records where applicable, benefit-sharing description, and a functioning grievance mechanism) and ensure alignment across the PDD, validation, and monitoring reports.

## Documents Reviewed

- Chestnut Mountain Monitoring Report 2019
- Chestnut Mountain ACR Monitoring Report 2019
- Chestnut Mountain PDD 2019
- Chestnut Mountain Verification Report 2019

### 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-FEE7F5FC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy