

QUALITY REPORT

Where the Buffalo Roam

CE-where-the-buffalo-ro · CAR

Report ID: CM-39160373 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project details beyond the project name, standard, and basic classification. With no accessible documentation on baseline setting, additionality, leakage, or verification outcomes, credit quality cannot be substantiated and should be treated as high risk until primary documents are available.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CE-where-the-buffalo-ro
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 baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability of any missing/partial information.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record.

~ The project is labeled as an avoidance credit type, but permanence/reversal provisions were not documented in the extracted record.

No project design or assurance information was found in the extracted record (no PDD, monitoring report, or verification report listed). As a result, additionality testing, baseline validity, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions cannot be confirmed from documents. This creates a high uncertainty of over-crediting and unaddressed risks.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verification/monitoring results were found in the extracted record.

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

The extracted record contains no public-facing MRV details such as monitoring periods, verification outcomes, or error rates, and no VVB is identified. With zero documents available, the completeness of registry information and the quality of monitoring/verification cannot be assessed. Transparency is therefore very weak based on available evidence.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline method and any reassessment were not found in the extracted record.

- CORSIA/CCP status and any double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record.

Claim safety is low because key eligibility and integrity signals (baseline method, leakage justification, and any CORSIA/CCP status) were not found in the extracted record. Without these, buyers cannot reliably assess greenwashing or over-crediting risk. Any marketing claims should be considered unsupported until primary documents are reviewed.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided (0 documents used).

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating document readability/ingestion issues.

No evidence documents were included in the extracted record and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable. This combination suggests major documentation gaps and/or ingestion issues. The lack of accessible source material prevents independent corroboration of project claims.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and extract the core CAR documents (project design document, monitoring report(s), and verification report(s)) including baseline method, additionality demonstration, leakage assessment, and any corrective actions.

→ Publish/confirm registry and assurance details (VVB name, monitoring periods, verification statements, and any CORSIA/CCP status) and re-run extraction with readable source files to raise confidence.

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-39160373 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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