

QUALITY REPORT

This Place is Nuts

CE-this-place-is-nuts · Verra · Brazil

Report ID: CM-CFD4A807 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.2
	■ 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 quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV) cannot be assessed. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high by default.

Project Details

Registry	Verra
Registry ID	CE-this-place-is-nuts
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 assessment of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable or not captured, undermining reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record

~ Project is labeled as an avoidance credit type, but permanence/leakage/baseline details are not documented here

No project design, baseline method, additionality assessment, leakage treatment, or permanence risk management information was found in the extracted record because no evidence documents were captured. With low extraction confidence, even if documents exist externally, the current record cannot support an integrity assessment. Scores are therefore conservative to reflect an unverified baseline and unsubstantiated additionality/leakage controls.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or quantified verification outcomes were found in the extracted record

- Registry completeness cannot be evaluated because no evidence documents were captured

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record includes no verification/monitoring reports, no VVB identification, and no monitoring period information. Without documents, there is no way to compare claimed versus verified outcomes or evaluate MRV quality. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the record is complete.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- No information found on baseline setting, leakage justification, or eligibility statuses that affect claim risk (e.g., CORSIA/CCP)

~ With no documents, over-crediting risk cannot be bounded and should be treated as elevated

Claim safety is low because there is no documented basis to judge over-crediting risk (baseline setting, leakage justification, or any conservative parameters). No information was found on CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so potential downstream claim risks cannot be screened. In the absence of evidence, the project should be treated as high risk for marketing claims.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero evidence documents were captured (0 documents used)

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability or missing capture of key sources

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record shows zero evidence documents and zero documents used. Minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key source was poorly readable or not successfully extracted. This prevents any meaningful validation of project attributes or performance.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Permanence controls not documented
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the most recent verification and monitoring reports (including VVB name, monitoring period, and any findings/corrective actions) so additionality, baseline, and MRV can be assessed

→ Disclose leakage assessment (including any deduction and justification), baseline reassessment timing, and any eligibility/label statuses (e.g., CORSIA and CCP) to reduce 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-CFD4A807 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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