

QUALITY REPORT

USA/NCA/FC/CAR/22072025/00018

OG-687f7e9c · CAR · United States Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-C82C8091 · 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 documentation, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence controls, and MRV results) cannot be substantiated. Given the low readability flag and zero documents captured, this project should be treated as high uncertainty and high over-crediting/greenwashing risk until primary documents are reviewed.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	OG-687f7e9c
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	United States Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring results
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or incorrect facts

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality approach, baseline method, leakage treatment, and permanence controls were not found in the extracted record

~ Soil carbon projects typically have material permanence and measurement uncertainty, but risk management details were not available to assess

No official documents were captured in the extracted record, so the baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage assessment, and permanence risk management (e.g., buffer pool or reversal provisions) are not stated in available documents. For a soil carbon project, these elements are central to integrity, and their absence creates a high uncertainty profile. No information was found on material findings or corrective actions from validation/verification.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

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

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

Transparency is very limited because no evidence documents were captured and no verifier (VVB) details, monitoring period, or quantified monitoring/verification outcomes were found in the extracted record. As a result, MRV quality and registry completeness cannot be substantiated from the available materials. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that key disclosures were successfully captured.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- No information found on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, or safeguards against over-crediting (e.g., conservative baselines, leakage deductions)

~ Without ERR claimed vs verified figures, the risk of over-issuance cannot be evaluated

Claim safety is weak because the extracted record provides no basis to assess over-crediting controls (baseline conservativeness, leakage deductions, usage monitoring, or uncertainty deductions). No information was found on CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so potential double-claim/market-eligibility signaling risks cannot be evaluated. With no claimed-versus-verified results available, the reliability of any listed credits cannot be checked.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, leaving major evidence gaps

- Low extraction confidence suggests document quality/readability issues and reduces reliability

Documentation quality is very poor: the extracted record shows zero documents used and an overall low extraction confidence. This indicates either missing source files or unreadable/poorly parsed documents, which materially undermines the ability to verify any project claims. Recency, independence of verification, and the presence of corrective actions cannot be assessed without the underlying reports.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide and extract the core CAR documents (PDD/project design, validation/verification reports, monitoring reports, and registry issuance/retirement records) so baseline, additionality, leakage, permanence, and MRV can be assessed
- Improve document readability/parse quality (higher extraction confidence) and include quantified results (monitoring period, ERR claimed vs verified, uncertainty/leakage deductions, reversals/buffer contributions) to enable a defensible quality evaluation

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-C82C8091 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy