

QUALITY REPORT

Amazon Rainforest Preservation

CE-amazon-rainforest-pr · Cool Effect · Brazil

Report ID: CM-E5A6FB2E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.5
	■ 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 integrity elements (baseline, additionality, leakage, and permanence provisions) cannot be validated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak MRV cannot be ruled out.

Project Details

Registry	Cool Effect
Registry ID	CE-amazon-rainforest-pr
Sector	redd
Country	Brazil
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 safeguards
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record (no documents available).

- ~ REDD projects typically require strong leakage and permanence controls, but none could be confirmed from the available evidence.

No project documents were captured in the extracted record, so the baseline method, additionality testing, leakage deduction/justification, and permanence measures (e.g., buffer pool, reversal procedures) are not stated in available documents. For a REDD project, these are central determinants of credit quality, and the absence of evidence warrants a very conservative integrity score. No information on material findings or corrective actions was found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (VVB, monitoring period, ERR claimed vs verified) were found in the extracted record.

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

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and no monitoring or verification details. The VVB name, monitoring period, and any comparison of emissions reductions claimed versus verified are not stated in available documents. With low extraction confidence, even if documents exist elsewhere, they were not reliably captured here.

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline method and reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record.

- ~ Eligibility/labels that affect claims (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for marketing claims.

Claim safety is weak due to the inability to validate whether credits are conservatively quantified and appropriately labeled. The extracted record does not state the baseline approach, leakage treatment, or any eligibility status (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval), so buyers face elevated greenwashing and over-crediting uncertainty. Without documentation, it is not possible to assess whether claims align with robust MRV and accounting expectations for REDD.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, indicating a major evidence gap.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues, reducing auditability.

Documentation quality is extremely poor in the extracted record: zero documents were used and the minimum extraction confidence is low. This prevents independent checking of key assertions and suggests at least one key source was poorly readable or otherwise not extractable. The lack of captured verification/monitoring reports also prevents assessing recency and audit trail completeness.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide and link the PDD, monitoring reports, and the latest verification report (including VVB name, monitoring period, and verified vs claimed ERs) so baseline, additionality, and MRV can be assessed.
- Disclose permanence and leakage controls (buffer pool percentage, reversal procedures, quantified leakage deduction and justification) and publish safeguards evidence (FPIC, grievance mechanism, stakeholder consultation).

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-E5A6FB2E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy