

QUALITY REPORT

Power for Our Planet

CE-power-for-our-planet · Gold Standard · Brazil

Report ID: CM-964DCB48 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4Overall 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 quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV results) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high by default.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CE-power-for-our-planet
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 used), preventing verification of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring results.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability of any conclusions.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record (no documents captured).

~ The project is described as an avoidance credit type, but permanence/leakage/baseline risks cannot be evaluated without source documents.

No project design or assurance information was found in the extracted record (no evidence documents captured), so additionality testing, baseline validity, leakage treatment, and any non-conformities cannot be evaluated. Because these are foundational to avoidance credit integrity, the score is heavily penalized for missing evidence.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed ER figures were found in the extracted record (no documents captured).

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were provided.

The extracted record contains no monitoring/verification details (no VVB identified, no monitoring period, and no claimed-versus-verified emission reductions). With no documents captured and low extraction confidence, MRV transparency and registry completeness cannot be substantiated.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, leakage justification, and any default factors were not found in the extracted record.

- CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.

Without documentation of the baseline method, leakage justification/deductions, or verified ER totals, the risk of over-crediting cannot be meaningfully assessed and is treated conservatively. Eligibility signals relevant to claims (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, increasing greenwashing risk for public claims.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used and no evidence documents were listed, indicating a major evidence gap.

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting poor readability/quality of at least one key source.

Documentation is the primary weakness: the extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates low extraction confidence. This combination suggests either missing inputs or unreadable/failed extraction, so the project cannot be assessed against standard quality criteria.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Avoidance type but not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	No baseline method found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, latest monitoring report, and latest verification report so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV results can be checked against Gold Standard requirements.

→ Provide registry extracts (issuance/retirement records) and explicit statements on CORSIA eligibility and any CCP/ICVCM status to reduce downstream claim and double-claim 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-964DCB48 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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