

QUALITY REPORT

Makira Rainforest Conservation

CE-makira-rainforest-co · Cool Effect · Madagascar

Report ID: CM-7D5B209E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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, permanence/buffer) cannot be verified. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claim substantiation is high based on evidence gaps alone.

Project Details

Registry	Cool Effect
Registry ID	CE-makira-rainforest-co
Sector	redd
Country	Madagascar
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, and permanence provisions
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability of any missing/partial data

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Baseline, additionality approach, leakage treatment, and reversal/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record due to missing documentation

~ REDD projects typically require strong leakage and permanence controls, but these cannot be assessed here because no source documents were captured

No project design or assurance documents were available in the extracted record (no evidence documents listed), so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage deduction/justification, and permanence measures (e.g., buffer pool or reversal procedures) cannot be confirmed. Given the REDD context, these missing elements are material to credit integrity and warrant a conservative score. The extraction confidence is low, increasing the chance that key integrity-relevant details were not reliably captured from source files.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (VVB, monitoring period, errors, methods) were found in the extracted record

- Registry/public documentation completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were provided

The extracted record contains no monitoring report, verification report, or registry completeness indicators (no VVB name, monitoring period, or quantified uncertainty/error information). With zero documents captured, there is no basis to assess MRV quality or whether results were independently verified. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that transparency-related information would have been captured even if present in poorly readable files.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Eligibility/quality signals (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) and key quantification assumptions were not found in the extracted record

~ With no ERR/baseline/leakage figures available, over-crediting risk cannot be bounded and should be treated as elevated

No information was found in the extracted record on baseline setting, leakage controls, or any eligibility/quality labels (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status). Without these, claims based on the credits cannot be substantiated from the available evidence and the risk of over-crediting cannot be evaluated. The absence of any extracted quantitative parameters forces a conservative assessment of claim safety.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, indicating a major documentation completeness gap

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues that undermine auditability

The extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence document list, indicating severe incompleteness. In addition, the minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key document was poorly readable and reducing auditability. This combination justifies a very low documentation score and triggers the post-scoring gate rule that would cap transparency if applied.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence 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 the PDD and the most recent monitoring and verification reports so baseline, additionality, leakage, and permanence/buffer provisions can be assessed

→ Provide registry extracts (issuance/retirement records) and explicit CORSIA/CCP status statements to reduce double-claim and greenwashing 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-7D5B209E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy