

QUALITY REPORT

Phlogiston Phase I

CM-d230f9 · CAR Standard · United States

Report ID: CM-87211A80 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project’s quantified results appear internally consistent for the monitored period, with the verification report showing the same emissions reductions claimed and verified and no material findings. However, key integrity elements (baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any permanence/buffer provisions) are not clearly stated in the extracted record, which increases over-crediting and interpretation risk.

Project Details

Registry	CAR Standard
Registry ID	CM-d230f9
Sector	other
Country	United States
Vintage	2021, 2022, 2023
Project Methodology	Adipic Acid Production Protocol 1.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2031
VVB	Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.
Verified ERs	1,541,814 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and timing of any baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed and no leakage deduction is provided, despite leakage being a core integrity element that should be explicitly treated.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The verification report (2022-12-05) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline method, baseline reassessment timing, and leakage treatment are not stated in the extracted record, weakening confidence in the credited reductions.

The verification report (2022-12-05) confirms additionality was verified by the VVB and reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports procedural integrity. However, the baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is also not found, making it difficult to judge whether the counterfactual is conservative. Leakage is marked as not addressed and no leakage deduction is provided in the extracted record, which is a material integrity gap even for industrial avoidance projects if any displacement or upstream/downstream effects exist.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ The verification report provides a clear monitoring period (2022-07-01 to 2022-09-30) and shows identical claimed and verified reductions (1,541,814).

- Several core MRV/context fields (baseline method, leakage deduction, safeguards/grievance) are not found in the extracted record, reducing interpretability for external reviewers.

The verification report (2022-12-05) clearly specifies the monitoring period (2022-07-01 to 2022-09-30) and reports the same emissions reductions claimed and verified (1,541,814), which is a strong transparency signal for the reported outcome. The VVB is identified (Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.), aiding traceability. Still, several key explanatory elements (baseline method, leakage deduction/justification details, and safeguards/grievance information) are not found in the extracted record, limiting public interpretability.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ Claimed and verified reductions match in the verification report (2022-12-05), reducing immediate risk of arithmetic overstatement for this period.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and baseline/leakage details are missing, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk for downstream claims.

Because the verification report (2022-12-05) shows no discrepancy between claimed and verified reductions, the risk of overstatement due to verification adjustments appears low for this monitoring period. However, the baseline method is not stated in the extracted record and leakage is not addressed, both of which elevate over-crediting risk and make marketing claims harder to substantiate. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily infer whether additional aviation/ICVCM-related claim pathways could create confusion or heightened scrutiny.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

- + Multiple document types are referenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is high.
- Despite multiple documents, important fields (baseline, leakage, safeguards) were not captured in the extracted record, suggesting documentation gaps for key quality questions.

The extracted record indicates three supporting document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) alongside the verification report dated 2022-12-05, and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting document reliability. The crediting period (2021-01-20 to 2031-01-19) and the monitored period are both specified, indicating reasonable temporal completeness. Nonetheless, the absence (in the extracted record) of baseline, leakage, and safeguards/grievance details suggests either incomplete disclosure in the available documents or incomplete capture of key sections, which lowers documentation completeness for quality assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed in record
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose (or extract) the baseline approach used under the Adipic Acid Production Protocol and when it was last reassessed, with key parameters and justification.

→ Provide an explicit leakage assessment (even if concluded negligible) including rationale and any quantified deduction, and document safeguards/grievance provisions if applicable.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- 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-87211A80 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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