QUALITY REPORT

NZL/NCA/undefined/PLV/23072025/00020

OG-688088f6 · Plan Vivo · New Zealand Listed Credits

Report ID: CM-55A579D7 · 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 beyond basic identifiers, so core quality attributes (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the project's credit quality cannot be reliably assessed from the available evidence and should be treated as high risk until documents are provided.

Project Details

Registry	Plan Vivo
Registry ID	OG-688088f6
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	New Zealand Listed Credits
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, permanence, and monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable or not extractable, increasing the risk of missing or incorrect facts.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record due to missing documents.

~ Soil carbon projects typically have non-trivial permanence and reversal risks, but no buffer, reversal, or risk-management information was available to evaluate this.

No project documents (PDD, monitoring report, verification report) were available in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and permanence/risk management could not be confirmed. Given the sector is soil carbon, permanence and reversal management are especially important, but no buffer pool, reversal events, or risk mitigation information was found. This results in a very low integrity score driven by lack of evidence rather than confirmed poor practice.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (period, VVB, findings, or quantified results) were found in the extracted record.
- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no underlying documents were available.

The extracted record contains no VVB name, monitoring period, verification outcomes, or quantified results, so MRV transparency cannot be assessed. With no evidence documents listed and zero documents used, there is no basis to judge whether reporting is complete or publicly accessible. Transparency is therefore scored very low due to missing information.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline method, assumptions, and any error/uncertainty checks were not found in the extracted record.

~ Eligibility/labeling risks (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, so claims cannot be screened for double-claim/market-eligibility issues.

Without baseline methodology, leakage justification, uncertainty/error checks, or verified performance figures, the risk of over-crediting cannot be evaluated from the extracted record. No information was found on market-eligibility labels (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status), which increases the risk of inappropriate claims because screening cannot be performed. Claim safety is therefore low due to unassessable fundamentals.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, indicating a critical evidence gap.
- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability and suggests key content may be missing or unreadable.

The extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence document list, indicating a critical documentation gap. The minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key source was poorly readable or not extractable, further reducing reliability. Documentation is scored near the floor because the assessment cannot be grounded in primary sources.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	No additionality assessment found
● **Permanence**	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● **Leakage**	No leakage treatment found
● **Baseline**	Baseline method not found
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards not evidenced
● **Double-claim**	Eligibility/labels not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and extract the core Plan Vivo documents (Project Design/Project Document, latest monitoring report, and latest verification report) so baseline, additionality, leakage, permanence, and MRV can be assessed.

→ Publish or supply registry-linked evidence of issuance/retirement records and third-party verification details (VVB identity, monitoring period, findings, and quantified results) to support transparent claims.

Report ID: CM-55A579D7 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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