

QUALITY REPORT

CGR Guatapara Landfill Project

CNN-646137 · Gold Standard · Brazil

Report ID: CM-48AA4F71 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	1.6

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, key elements needed to judge credit quality (baseline approach, additionality demonstration, monitoring period, and verified emission reductions) were not found. With only one poorly readable/low-confidence source document, the risk of over-crediting and weak substantiation is high even though the project type (landfill methane avoidance) can be credible when well documented.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-646137
Sector	methane
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No baseline method, additionality test, or monitoring period found in the extracted record, preventing assessment of whether credits are justified.
- Verified emission reductions and VVB identity were not found, limiting confidence in MRV and independent assurance.
- Low extraction confidence and only one document available materially reduce reliability of any conclusions.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.2 / 10

- Additionality and baseline approach were not found in the extracted record (source document listed as unknown).
- ~ No material findings or corrective actions are recorded, but this is not meaningful given the missing verification details (source document listed as unknown).

The extracted record does not include the baseline method, methodology, or any reassessment timing, so baseline validity cannot be evaluated (source document listed as unknown). Additionality is also not evidenced because neither the type of additionality test nor confirmation by a VVB was found (source document listed as unknown). Leakage treatment is entirely missing (no deduction or justification found), which is a material integrity gap for methane projects where boundary and displacement effects must be addressed (source document listed as unknown).

Transparency — 0.8 / 10

- Monitoring period, claimed vs verified reductions, and monitoring approach were not found in the extracted record (source document listed as unknown).
- VVB name and key registry/eligibility fields (e.g., CORSIA) were not found in the extracted record (source document listed as unknown).

Core MRV transparency items are absent: the monitoring period, monitoring approach, and both claimed and verified emission reductions were not found in the extracted record (source document listed as unknown). The VVB name is not provided, preventing an assessment of independent assurance and audit trail (source document listed as unknown). Low extraction confidence further reduces transparency because it suggests the underlying document was poorly readable or incomplete.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, leakage treatment, and verified reductions were not found in the extracted record (source document listed as unknown).
- ~ Double-claim/market-eligibility risk cannot be judged because CCP/CORSIA status was not found in the extracted record (source document listed as unknown).

Because verified emission reductions were not found, there is no way to reconcile claimed versus verified outcomes or check for over-crediting signals (source document listed as unknown). Baseline and leakage information are also missing, which are central to defensible avoidance claims for landfill methane projects (source document listed as unknown). CCP status and CORSIA eligibility were not found, so downstream claim and double-claim risk cannot be screened (source document listed as unknown).

Documentation — 1.6 / 10

- Only one evidence document is listed and it is unidentified, with low extraction confidence (source document listed as unknown).
- Document date, methodology/version, and crediting period were not found in the extracted record (source document listed as unknown).

Documentation is very weak: only one evidence document is listed and it is labeled as unknown, with low extraction confidence (source document listed as unknown). Key metadata such as document date, project name, methodology/version, and crediting period were not found, limiting traceability and recency checks (source document listed as unknown). While no material findings or corrective actions are recorded, the absence of verification details makes this non-informative.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer information not found
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not found
● Double-claim	CCP/CORSIA status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the Gold Standard PDD, monitoring report(s), and verification/certification report(s) with readable text, including baseline methodology, additionality demonstration, and monitoring period.
- Disclose claimed and verified emission reductions for each monitoring period, the VVB name, and explicit leakage assessment (deduction and justification), plus CCP/CORSIA eligibility statements from the registry or certification documents.

Documents Reviewed

- Gold Standard Registry — GS-6553

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-48AA4F71 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy