QUALITY REPORT

MORRO DO FOGO FARM PROJECT – REDD + ARR

CC-22 · CAR · Brazil

Report ID: CM-F6913CD6 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.9

Overall Score out of 10

Integrity (35%)	**0.7**
Transparency (25%)	**1.8**
Claim Safety (25%)	**3.4**
Documentation (15%)	**2.4**

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record for this REDD+ARR project is too thin to substantiate core carbon-integrity elements such as additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and permanence risk management. While the project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, the lack of verifiable MRV details and low document readability materially increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CC-22
Sector	redd
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2023
Project Methodology	UCF REDD + ARR
Crediting Period	2023 — 2024
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2023
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, which is critical for REDD/ARR credit integrity.
- ■ No additionality test or VVB confirmation of additionality was found in the extracted record.
- ■ Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) was not found in the extracted record despite being material for REDD/ARR.
- ■ Permanence risk management is unclear: no buffer pool contribution and no reversal reporting were found in the extracted record.
- ■ Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, reducing reliability of all extracted conclusions.
- ■ Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- ■ Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 0.7 / 10

- Additionality, baseline method, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions (buffer/reversals) were not found in the extracted record (documents listed as unknown/methodology).

~ No material findings or corrective actions are listed, but the underlying verification/monitoring evidence is not clearly identified (document type unknown).

For a REDD+ARR project, the extracted record does not provide an additionality test, a baseline method, or any baseline reassessment date (documents listed as unknown/methodology). Leakage is also not addressed: neither a leakage deduction nor a justification was found in the extracted record. Permanence risk management is unclear because no buffer pool contribution and no reversal-event reporting were found in the extracted record, even though these are central to land-sector credit integrity.

Transparency — 1.8 / 10

- VVB name, registry details, and verified vs claimed ER/ERR figures were not found in the extracted record (document type unknown).

~ A monitoring period and crediting period are provided, but the MRV methods and results are not (documents listed as unknown).

Transparency is weak because the extracted record does not identify the VVB, the registry, or any claimed-versus-verified ER/ERR totals (document type is unknown). Although a monitoring period (2023-05-18 to 2023-05-24) and a crediting period (2023-05-24 to 2024-05-24) are provided, the monitoring methods and quantified outcomes are not found in the extracted record. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that missing items are truly absent rather than unreadable.

Claim Safety — 3.4 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing one channel of double-claim/eligibility risk (extracted record).

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline, leakage, and verified ER/ERR are not found in the extracted record (documents listed as unknown).

Claim safety is constrained by the inability to validate core drivers of credit quantity: baseline setting, leakage, and verified ER/ERR are not found in the extracted record (documents listed as unknown/methodology). The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one form of eligibility-based double-claim risk, but CCP status is not found in the extracted record. With no verified results and no leakage/baseline detail, the risk of overstated climate claims remains elevated.

Documentation — 2.4 / 10

- Minimum extraction confidence is low and key fields are missing, indicating weak document readability/coverage (extracted record).

- Evidence documents are not clearly identified beyond “unknown” and “methodology,” limiting auditability (evidence list).

Documentation quality is low because the evidence set is minimal and poorly specified (evidence documents include “unknown” and “methodology”), and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was hard to read. The document date is provided (2023-07-18), but the document type is unknown, and key verification/monitoring artifacts (e.g., VVB identity and quantified findings) are not found in the extracted record. The absence of listed corrective actions is not very informative given the unclear provenance of the underlying reports.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	No additionality assessment found
Permanence	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
Baseline	Baseline method not found
Safeguards	No FPIC/grievance/safeguards evidenced
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full verification/monitoring report(s) identifying the VVB, the quantified claimed vs verified ER/ERR, and any material findings/corrective actions.

→ Disclose and document the baseline approach (including reassessment schedule), leakage quantification/justification and deduction, and permanence risk management (buffer pool contribution and reversal monitoring).

Documents Reviewed

- Support Document 1
- Support Document 2
- Support Document 3
- Support Document 4

Report ID: CM-F6913CD6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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