

## QUALITY REPORT

# Landfill gas recovery, energy generation and biogas distribution from CTR Santa Rosa

CDM-2cd4a5 · CDM Standard · Brazil

Report ID: CM-0A1A2633 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.5**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
■ Documentation (15%)	6.6

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

## Assessment Summary

This CDM landfill gas-to-energy project has a reasonably strong additionality signal because the VVB confirmed an investment test, and no material findings or corrective actions were reported in the extracted record. However, key integrity elements (leakage treatment, baseline reassessment timing, and quantified ER figures) are missing or not addressed in the available documents, and safeguards reporting is inconsistent across documents.

## Project Details

Registry	CDM Standard
Registry ID	CDM-2cd4a5
Sector	biogas
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2012
Project Methodology	ACM0001 11
Crediting Period	2012-07-01 — not_stated
VVB	Bureau Veritas Certification
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, with no leakage deduction stated, despite a project type where leakage considerations are typically expected.
- No verified or claimed emission reduction totals were found in the extracted record for the stated monitoring period, limiting confidence in MRV outcomes.
- Safeguards reporting is contradictory between the PDD (mentions safeguards) and the monitoring report (does not), raising reliability concerns.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- The monitoring report does not address leakage and provides no leakage deduction, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB via an investment test. The monitoring report (2018) shows no material findings and no corrective actions in the extracted record, which supports procedural robustness. However, leakage is explicitly not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the monitoring report, and the baseline is described only as project-specific with no baseline reassessment date found, which weakens integrity confidence.

### Transparency — 5.0 / 10

- + The VVB is identified (Bureau Veritas Certification) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2017-07-01 to 2017-12-31) in the monitoring report (2018).
- Claimed and verified ER totals were not found in the extracted record, and the usage monitoring approach is not stated.

Transparency is moderate: the monitoring report (2018) clearly specifies the monitoring period (2017-07-01 to 2017-12-31) and identifies the VVB as Bureau Veritas Certification. At the same time, total emission reductions (claimed and verified) were not found in the extracted record, and the monitoring approach for any end-use/biogas distribution is not stated, limiting third-party reproducibility of results.

### Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing certain aviation-claim risks.
- Over-crediting risk is harder to rule out because leakage is not addressed and ER totals (claimed/verified) are not available in the extracted record.

Claim safety benefits from the project being explicitly not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, which reduces the risk of certain overlapping compliance claims. Nonetheless, greenwashing/over-crediting risk remains because leakage is not addressed and there are no extracted totals for claimed or verified ERs for the monitoring period, making it difficult to assess whether credited reductions are conservative.

### Documentation — 6.6 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.
- Crediting period end is not stated and safeguards information is inconsistent between documents, reducing documentation reliability.

Documentation quality is relatively strong given three key document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is high. However, the crediting period end date is not stated in the extracted record, and safeguards-related information is inconsistent across documents, which reduces confidence that non-carbon requirements are being tracked consistently over time.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed; no deduction stated
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards inconsistently documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring/verification tables showing total ERs claimed and verified for 2017-07-01 to 2017-12-31, including any uncertainty/adjustments applied by the VVB.

→ Explicitly address leakage in the monitoring report (quantify and deduct, or justify negligible leakage consistent with ACM0001) and document safeguards/grievance arrangements consistently across PDD and monitoring reports.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification Report

### 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-0A1A2633 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)