

QUALITY REPORT

Walk in the Woods

CE-walk-in-the-woods · ACR · Montana

Report ID: CM-957FEC6A · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| 1.4 Overall Score out of 10 | ■ Integrity (35%) | 2.0 |
| | ■ Transparency (25%) | 0.5 |
| | ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 2.0 |
| | ■ Documentation (15%) | 0.8 |

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality determinants (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV results) cannot be verified. Given the low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the project should be treated as high uncertainty and high over-crediting/greenwashing risk until primary sources are reviewed.

Project Details

| | |
|-------------|--------------------------------|
| Registry | American Carbon Registry (ACR) |
| Registry ID | CE-walk-in-the-woods |
| Sector | other |
| Country | Montana |
| 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, permanence, and monitoring results
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable or not reliably extracted, increasing the risk of missing or incorrect critical facts

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

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

~ Removal project type implies permanence and reversal risk may be material, but reversal/buffer information was not found in the extracted record

No official documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline selection/reassessment, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool or reversal management) cannot be confirmed. Because this is a removal project, reversal risk could be material, but no reversal events, buffer contribution, or monitoring controls were found in the extracted record. This warrants a conservative integrity score until primary ACR documents are reviewed.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or verification outcomes were found in the extracted record (no documents available)

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and no information on the VVB, monitoring period, or verification outcomes. Without monitoring/verification figures or methods, MRV quality and registry completeness cannot be assessed from the provided materials. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the record reflects what is in the underlying documents.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and quantified monitoring/verification results were not found in the extracted record

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

Claim safety is weak because the extracted record provides no basis to evaluate over-crediting risk (no baseline method, no verified removals, no uncertainty/error reporting). Eligibility signals that affect marketing claims (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unresolved. Given the absence of auditable evidence, public claims should be treated as high risk pending document review.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, so the record is not auditable from the provided materials

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability and suggests missing/illegible source content

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates low extraction confidence. This prevents independent checking of key assertions (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and verification findings). The lack of any captured documents justifies a very low documentation score and triggers the post-processing gate that would cap transparency.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| ● Additionality | No additionality assessment found |
| ● Permanence | Reversal/buffer not evidenced |
| ● Leakage | No leakage treatment found |
| ● Baseline | Baseline method not found |
| ● Safeguards | Safeguards not evidenced |
| ● Double-claim | Eligibility/CCP status not evidenced |

What Would Improve This Score

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

→ Ensure documents are machine-readable/high-quality scans and include VVB statements, quantified uncertainty/error, any corrective actions, and permanence provisions (buffer contribution and reversal procedures)

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-957FEC6A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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