

QUALITY REPORT

Rice Ranch Methane Abatement

CM-92336f · BCarbon · United States

Report ID: CM-73F1AD8E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
■ Transparency (25%)	3.9
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

The validation record indicates the project's additionality was confirmed by the VVB and no material findings or corrective actions were reported. However, key quantifications needed to judge credit integrity (baseline approach, leakage treatment, monitoring period, and verified emission reductions) were not found in the extracted documents, increasing over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	BCarbon
Registry ID	CM-92336f
Sector	other
Country	United States
Vintage	2024
Project Methodology	BCarbon's Methane Capture and Reclamation Protocol V1.1
VVB	ALL Consulting
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual.
- Leakage treatment (deduction percentage and justification) was not found in the extracted record.
- No claimed or verified emission reduction totals were found in the extracted record, and the monitoring period was not stated.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ The validation report (2024) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline method, leakage treatment, and any permanence/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record, creating material uncertainty on over-crediting risk.

The validation report (2024-08-12) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (ALL Consulting), and it reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. However, the baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, which makes it difficult to judge whether the counterfactual is conservative. Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) and permanence provisions such as a buffer pool or any reversal reporting were also not found in the extracted record, so integrity is constrained by evidence gaps.

Transparency — 3.9 / 10

+ A named VVB (ALL Consulting) and a dated validation report (2024-08-12) are available.

- Monitoring period and claimed vs verified emission reductions were not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record does not include a monitoring period, usage monitoring approach, or any claimed versus verified emission reduction totals. While the validation report (2024) and PDD are listed and the VVB is named, the absence of quantified MRV outputs prevents an external reader from reconciling what was measured and what was credited. Registry details are minimal (listed as "other"), further reducing traceability.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing certain aviation-claim risks.

- Missing baseline and leakage details elevate over-crediting and greenwashing risk for public claims.

The extracted record states the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of certain high-profile compliance claims. Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened because baseline and leakage information were not found in the extracted record, and there are no claimed or verified emission reduction totals to anchor marketing claims. CCP status was not found in the extracted record, adding uncertainty for buyers seeking alignment with higher-integrity labels.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

+ Two core documents are referenced (validation report and PDD), with a recent validation date (2024).

- Several key fields are absent from the extracted record (e.g., monitoring period, baseline method, leakage, ERR totals), and extraction confidence is only medium.

Documentation coverage is moderate: the evidence list includes a validation report and a PDD, and the validation is recent (2024-08-12). However, many decision-critical items are not present in the extracted record (baseline method, leakage, monitoring period, ERR totals, buffer/pooling), suggesting either incomplete disclosure in the available documents or incomplete extraction. Minimum extraction confidence is medium, which supports a mid-range documentation score rather than high confidence.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced
● Safeguards	No FPIC/grievance/safeguards evidenced
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose (or extract) the baseline approach used under the BCarbon protocol, including any reassessment schedule and key parameters, so the counterfactual can be evaluated.

→ Provide the monitoring period and a reconciliation of claimed vs verified emission reductions (with calculation worksheets), including any leakage assessment and deductions.

Documents Reviewed

- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification Report

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-73F1AD8E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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