

QUALITY REPORT

Angico energia

CT-197 · I-REC · Brazil

Report ID: CM-4FD82B88 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	2.4

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

Assessment Summary

Only an issuance-type record was available, with most core quality fields (baseline, additionality, monitoring period, and verified generation/ERR) not found in the extracted record. With no stated methodology, MRV details, or eligibility/claims context, the risk of over-crediting and weak substantiation is high. No contradictions were detected, but the evidence base is too thin to support strong quality conclusions.

Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	CT-197
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2022
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No baseline approach or methodology identified in the extracted record, limiting confidence that credits reflect real avoided emissions.
- No monitoring period, verified output/ERR, or VVB information found, preventing assessment of MRV rigor and independent assurance.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.2 / 10

- Additionality and baseline approach were not found in the extracted record (issuance record only).
- ~ No material findings or corrective actions were reported, but this is not meaningful without the underlying verification/monitoring documentation.

The extracted record does not state any additionality test or confirmation by an independent verifier, so additionality robustness cannot be assessed from the issuance record. The baseline method and any reassessment timing were also not found, which is a major gap for an avoidance renewable energy project. No buffer pool or reversal information is provided (less central for avoidance projects), and leakage treatment was not found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 0.8 / 10

- Key MRV fields (monitoring period, verified ERR, usage monitoring method) were not found in the extracted record.
- Validator/verifier identity was not found, reducing traceability of assurance.

The issuance record does not provide a monitoring period, verified emissions reductions/energy output, or the verifier's name, so MRV transparency is very limited. No usage monitoring method or other operational monitoring details were found in the extracted record. While no material findings or corrective actions are listed, the absence of the underlying verification/monitoring reports prevents checking completeness.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- No information found on CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, increasing uncertainty around downstream claims and double-claim risk.
- No grid emission factor/baseline inputs found, increasing over-crediting risk for an avoidance renewable energy claim.

Key parameters that typically underpin avoidance claims—such as the grid emission factor and its vintage, and the baseline approach—were not found in the extracted record, elevating over-crediting risk. The record also does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, leaving uncertainty about how credits might be marketed and whether double-claim risks are adequately managed. With no verified ERR value found, the strength of the quantified claim cannot be evaluated.

Documentation — 2.4 / 10

- Only one document of unknown type/source was used, and the document date was not found.
- ~ Extraction confidence was medium, but the record remains incomplete for quality assessment.

Documentation is thin: only one evidence document is referenced and it is labeled as unknown, with no document date found. The minimum extraction confidence is medium, but the lack of core fields suggests either missing source documents or incomplete disclosure in the available record. With no verifier identified and no monitoring/verification report content available, independent assurance cannot be substantiated.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Avoidance project; reversal provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not found
● Double-claim	Eligibility/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring report and verification/assurance statement showing the monitoring period, verified MWh/ERR, and the VVB/assurance provider identity.

→ Disclose the applied baseline/methodology (including grid emission factor source and year) and any leakage and safeguards procedures (FPIC, grievance mechanism).

Documents Reviewed

- I-REC Device Register — PROTON01

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-4FD82B88 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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