

QUALITY REPORT

Stopping Ocean Plastic 2

CT-365 · Gold Standard · Brazil

Report ID: CM-D75A1F1F · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.6

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.5
■ 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) cannot be substantiated. Given the low readability flag and zero documents captured, this project scores very low on transparency and documentation, with elevated over-crediting and greenwashing risk due to unverifiable claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CT-365
Sector	other
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2022
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or misread critical information.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record because no documents were captured.

~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying sources.

No official project documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. With these core integrity elements unverified, the project must be scored conservatively. The low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that key integrity information is missing or unreadable.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed results were found in the extracted record due to missing documents.

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

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and therefore no information on the VVB, monitoring period, or any comparison of claimed versus verified results. Registry completeness and MRV quality cannot be assessed from the available extraction. The low extraction confidence also reduces confidence that transparency-related disclosures were captured accurately.

Claim Safety — 2.5 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and leakage assumptions are not available in the extracted record.

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, so double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be screened.

Claim safety is weak because the extracted record provides no basis to evaluate over-crediting risks (baseline setting, leakage, or monitoring rigor). Eligibility indicators relevant to double-claim risk (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) are not stated in available documents. As a result, buyers face elevated greenwashing risk because claims cannot be substantiated from the extracted materials.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, leaving the assessment unsupported by primary sources.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document quality/readability issues that reduce reliability even if documents exist elsewhere.

Documentation is extremely poor: the extracted record shows zero documents used and an overall low extraction confidence. This combination indicates both a completeness gap (no sources) and a reliability gap (at least one key document was poorly readable). Without primary documents, independent review of project assertions is not possible.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence/reversal provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, monitoring report(s), and verification/validation report(s) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be assessed from primary sources.

→ Improve document quality/readability (or provide text-searchable PDFs) and include registry/VVB details (VVB name, monitoring period, verified results, and any eligibility/labeling status) to reduce evidence gaps and 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-D75A1F1F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy