

QUALITY REPORT

The Dirt on Dirt

CE-the-dirt-on-dirt-hbo · CAR

Report ID: CM-507C9322 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality attributes (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV) cannot be substantiated. Given the low extraction confidence and zero documents available, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high by default.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CE-the-dirt-on-dirt-hbo
Sector	soil_carbon
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

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

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.2 / 10

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

~ Soil carbon removals typically have non-trivial reversal risk, but buffer pool, reversal monitoring, and corrective actions are not evidenced here.

No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions are not stated in available documents. For a soil carbon removal project, reversal risk management (e.g., buffer pool contribution, monitoring for reversals, and any reversal events) is critical, but none of these elements were found in the extracted record. With no verification/monitoring reports to reference, integrity cannot be substantiated and is scored very low.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or quantified MRV outputs were found in the extracted record due to missing documentation.

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

Transparency is very limited because there are no evidence documents listed and no extracted details on the VVB, monitoring period, or MRV procedures. Without verification/monitoring outputs (e.g., claimed vs verified removals or error rates), the quality of reporting cannot be assessed. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the record is complete.

Claim Safety — 1.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated (no baseline method, no leakage justification, no verified vs claimed removals) because no documents were available.

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unresolved.

Claim safety is weak by default because the extracted record provides no basis to evaluate over-crediting controls (baseline method, leakage justification/deductions, or reconciliation of claimed vs verified removals). Eligibility signals that can affect claim risk (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, leaving potential double-claim/marketability narratives ungrounded. Given the absence of auditable evidence, conservative scoring is warranted.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero evidence documents were provided/used, so the record is not auditable from the extracted materials.

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability even if some sources existed outside the extracted record.

Documentation is scored extremely low because the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents were used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the likelihood of missing critical information. With no dated monitoring/verification materials, recency and third-party assurance cannot be evaluated.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal controls not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed in record
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	Eligibility/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the CAR project documents (PDD, monitoring reports, verification reports, and registry issuance/retirement records) so additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV can be audited.

→ Improve document readability/extraction quality (higher-confidence OCR or native PDFs) and include VVB details, monitoring period, and claimed vs verified removals with any findings/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-507C9322 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy