

QUALITY REPORT

UNDO trial enhanced rock weathering project in Canada

CT-649 · Gold Standard · Canada

Report ID: CM-76798CF7 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.9Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.2
■ 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, MRV, leakage, and safeguards) cannot be substantiated. Given the very low documentation completeness and low extraction confidence, the risk of over-crediting and weak claim substantiation is high based on available evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CT-649
Sector	dac
Country	Canada
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 baseline, additionality, MRV, leakage, or safeguards
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record
- No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying documents

No project design or assurance documents were available in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and permanence/reversal provisions cannot be confirmed. With no monitoring or verification report evidence, there is no basis to assess whether credited removals/avoidance are conservative. The absence of any stated buffer, reversal events, or leakage deductions should be treated as an evidence gap rather than a positive finding.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or quantified monitoring/verification results were found in the extracted record
- Registry-relevant fields (e.g., CORSIA eligibility, MRV methods) were not found in the extracted record

Transparency is very weak because no documents were available to confirm the VVB, monitoring period, MRV methods, or any verified results. The extracted record provides no ERR claimed versus verified figures, no uncertainty treatment, and no registry completeness indicators beyond the registry code. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that missing items are merely absent rather than unreadable.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and monitoring assumptions were not found in the extracted record
- Double-claim/eligibility status (e.g., CORSIA/CCP) was not found in the extracted record

Claim safety is low because the extracted record does not include baseline methodology, monitoring approach, or any third-party verification outcomes that would bound over-crediting risk. Eligibility/status indicators relevant to claim risk (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, so double-claim risk cannot be screened. Given the lack of substantiation, any public claims would be difficult to defend.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided/parsed (0 documents used)
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability of at least one key source

Documentation is effectively absent: the extracted record lists zero evidence documents and zero documents used. Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable, which further undermines completeness and reliability. Without core documents (PDD, monitoring report, verification report), the project cannot be assessed against standard quality expectations.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and parse the core Gold Standard documentation set (PDD/design document, monitoring report, and VVB validation/verification report) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be assessed

→ Disclose registry and assurance details (VVB name, monitoring period, claimed vs verified results, uncertainty treatment, and any eligibility/claiming status such as CORSIA/CCP) to reduce claim and double-counting risk

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-76798CF7 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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