

## QUALITY REPORT

# BRA/NCA/undefined/VER/23052025/00001

OG-683041c6 · VCS · Brazil Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-F65F51C1 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>1.1</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>1.5</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>0.0</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>2.0</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>0.8</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core integrity and MRV elements cannot be verified. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak substantiation is high for a soil carbon project.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	OG-683041c6
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Brazil Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, and permanence provisions
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability of any conclusions

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.5 / 10

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

~ Soil carbon projects typically require strong permanence and leakage controls, but these could not be assessed from the available record

No project documents were available in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage deduction/justification, buffer pool contribution, and any reversal events could not be verified. For a soil carbon project, these elements are central to integrity, and their absence materially increases uncertainty and downside risk. As a result, integrity is scored very low due to an evidence gap rather than a confirmed deficiency.

### Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring/verification information was found in the extracted record due to missing documents

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

With zero documents captured, there is no accessible monitoring period, VVB information, or quantified comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions in the extracted record. Low extraction confidence further suggests that even if documents exist, they were not reliably readable/extracted. Transparency is therefore very weak based on the available record.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline and monitoring assumptions were not found in the extracted record

~ Eligibility/labeling risks (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) cannot be assessed from the available record

Because baseline and monitoring assumptions were not found in the extracted record, the risk of over-crediting cannot be meaningfully evaluated. Likewise, any information on CCP approval or CORSIA eligibility was not found, leaving buyers exposed to labeling and double-claim concerns. Claim safety is scored low due to the inability to substantiate claims from documents.

### Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided/usable in the extracted record (0 documents used)

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues

The extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents used, which is a critical documentation failure for due diligence. The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key document was poorly readable and reducing confidence in completeness. Documentation is therefore scored near the floor.

## Risk Indicators

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

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full VCS project document set (PDD, monitoring report(s), verification report(s), and registry issuance/retirement records) so baseline, additionality, leakage, and permanence can be assessed

→ Improve document readability/extraction quality (higher-resolution scans or native PDFs) and include explicit permanence risk management (buffer pool %, reversal monitoring) and leakage quantification/justification

### 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-F65F51C1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy