QUALITY REPORT

Citizens of the Amazon

CE-jacunda-forest-reser · Verra · Brazil

Report ID: CM-1B858930 · 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, and MRV performance) cannot be substantiated. Given the low readability flag and zero documents captured, the project should be treated as high uncertainty and high over-crediting/greenwashing risk until primary sources are reviewed.

Project Details

Registry	Verra
Registry ID	CE-jacunda-forest-reser
Sector	other
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring quality

■ Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or misread critical details

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any reversals/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record (no documents captured)

~ The project is described as an avoidance credit type, but permanence and leakage controls cannot be confirmed without source documents

No project design or assurance documents were available in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and any permanence risk management (such as buffer contributions or reversal reporting) cannot be confirmed. The only contextual cue is that the credit type is described as avoidance, but that does not substitute for documented baseline and leakage controls. This warrants a conservative integrity score due to major evidence gaps.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verification/monitoring results were found in the extracted record (no documents captured)
- Registry-relevant fields such as CORSIA eligibility and MRV parameters were not found in the extracted record

Transparency is very weak because no monitoring report, verification report, or registry-complete fields were captured in the extracted record. Without a VVB name, monitoring period, or any claimed-versus-verified results, MRV quality cannot be evaluated. The low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that key transparency elements were missed.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

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

~ Double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be screened because CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record

Claim safety is low because the extracted record does not include the baseline method, leakage justification, or any quantified parameters that would allow screening for over-crediting risk. Eligibility indicators relevant to double-claim risk (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record. As a result, marketing claims would be difficult to substantiate based on the available evidence.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided in the extracted record (0 documents used)
- Low extraction confidence suggests documentation may be incomplete or unreadable, reducing reliability

Documentation is the primary weakness: the extracted record shows zero evidence documents and zero documents used. In addition, the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the chance of missing critical information. This combination materially reduces confidence in any assessment and triggers the documentation gate risk (documentation below 3 would cap transparency post-scoring).

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 evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and re-extract the core Verra documents (PDD, monitoring report(s), verification report(s), and registry issuance/retirement pages) with readable scans to raise extraction confidence

→ Disclose and extract key quantified items: baseline method and reassessment date, leakage assessment and any deduction, monitoring period and verified ERs, VVB identity, and any permanence risk management (buffer contribution/reversal reporting)

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-1B858930 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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