QUALITY REPORT

ESTRE’s Paulínia Landfill Gas Project (EPLGP)

CNN-057fea · Gold Standard · Brazil

Report ID: CM-20A17398 · Generated: 2026-04-01 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.2
Transparency (25%)	6.2
Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

Evidence scope is partial: the marketplace page lists a PDD (accepted 16 Mar 2012) and validation materials, but no monitoring reports, verification/issuance evidence, or retirement records were provided here. As a landfill gas methane destruction project, integrity is typically stronger than many avoidance types, but additionality and baseline assumptions cannot be confirmed without recent monitoring/verification. Claim safety is constrained by very old crediting periods (2006–2020) and unclear vintage/retirement traceability from the information provided.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-057fea
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	37 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-03-27

Red Flags

- Very old crediting periods (2006–2020) with no vintage/issuance/retirement details provided for the 20,000 tCO2 on offer
- No monitoring reports or third-party verification/certification reports provided in the evidence excerpt, limiting substantiation of achieved ERs

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

~ Methane destruction projects generally have low permanence/leakage risk, but ER credibility depends on monitored gas/destruction data not provided here

- No verification/certification report evidence for achieved reductions in the provided materials (validation documents only)

The listing indicates methodology AM0003 v3 and a “simplified financial analysis for landfill gas capture projects,” which can support additionality, but no third-party verification of achieved reductions is provided here (only validation-related documents are referenced). For methane projects, baseline and ERs depend heavily on measured gas flow, methane fraction, destruction efficiency, and any regulatory requirements; none of these monitored values or regulatory additionality checks are visible in the provided evidence. Permanence risk is generally low for methane destruction (non-AFOLU), but baseline uncertainty remains without monitoring/verification data. Leakage is typically low for landfill gas capture, yet no quantified leakage treatment is shown in the provided materials.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ Multiple project documents are listed (PDD, revised monitoring plan, DNV validation materials, host approvals) in the marketplace entry

- Registry issuance/retirement records and MRV outputs (monitoring + verification reports) are not shown in the provided evidence

The marketplace entry is unusually detailed and lists multiple documents (PDD, revised monitoring plan, validation report/protocol, host party approvals, and comment compilation), which supports transparency relative to typical marketplace-only listings. However, the key MRV artifacts needed to validate performance—monitoring reports, verification/certification reports, and issuance/retirement records—are not included in the information provided. The registry is stated as Gold Standard, but no direct registry issuance/retirement data is presented here to independently confirm volumes and vintages.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

~ Gold Standard governance helps, but buyer claim depends on registry retirement traceability not evidenced here

- Likely older vintages given 2006–2020 crediting periods; increases greenwashing risk if marketed as current offsets

The project is described as Gold Standard and provides host party approval documents, which helps reduce some governance/double-counting concerns, but the buyer-facing claim still depends on clear retirement traceability and vintage—neither is shown in the provided excerpt. The crediting periods are old (2006–2013 and 2013–2020), increasing the risk that credits offered are older vintages and may be harder to defend as “current” climate claims. No CCP/ICVCM status is indicated, and no Article 6 authorization/corresponding adjustment information is provided (not required, but absence limits claim robustness for some buyers). Overall, a buyer could more safely claim “supported verified emission reductions (if retirement is evidenced on the registry)” than make strong, current-year offset claims based on the information shown.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ PDD (accepted 16 Mar 2012) and revised monitoring plan (approved 11 Dec 2010) are referenced, plus DNV validation materials

- Monitoring reports and verification/certification reports are not provided; documentation appears dated for MRV purposes

Documents referenced include a PDD (accepted 16 Mar 2012), a revised monitoring plan (approved 11 Dec 2010), and DNV validation materials; these support that the project was designed and validated. However, no monitoring reports or verification/certification reports for any monitoring periods are provided in the listing excerpt, and nothing indicates recent MRV activity. The documentation set appears dated, with the newest items in the excerpt being administrative MoC updates rather than MRV outputs. This limits the ability to assess whether the listed 20,000 tCO_2 are verified, issued, and eligible for retirement.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Additionality approach referenced (AM0003 financial analysis
Permanence	Non-AFOLU methane destruction; reversal risk is inherently l
Leakage	Leakage is typically low for landfill gas, but no quantified
Baseline	Baseline depends on monitored methane generation/flow and de
Safeguards	No safeguards/SD documentation shown in the excerpt (SDC rep
Double-claim	Gold Standard reduces risk, but no issuance/retirement seria

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the latest Gold Standard monitoring report(s) and corresponding third-party verification/certification report(s) covering the vintages being sold

→ Link to the official Gold Standard registry page showing issuance and retirement records (serial ranges) for the 20,000 tCO_2 offered

→ Disclose the exact vintage years and monitoring period end dates for the credits on offer, and confirm retirement/claim guidance for buyers

Documents Reviewed

- revised monitoring plan
- List of documents
- authorization
- 01 Sep 2008 - 31 Jan 2009
- 01 Aug 2007 - 29 Feb 2008
- List of interviewed persons
- Compilation of all comments received
- approval
- 01 Aug 2010 - 31 Oct 2010
- Explanation of taking due account of comments
- 01 Dec 2011 - 31 May 2012
- 01 Jun 2012 - 30 Sep 2012
- 01 May 2011 - 30 Nov 2011
- 01 Feb 2009 - 30 Jun 2009
- Appendix 2 - Enclosure
- 01 Feb 2007 - 31 Jul 2007
- 01 Oct 2012 - 13 Sep 2013
- registration request form
- 01 Jul 2009 - 25 Feb 2010
- 01 Mar 2008 - 31 Aug 2008
- 01 Nov 2010 - 31 Jan 2011
- 01 Feb 2011 - 30 Apr 2011
- 14 Sep 2006 - 31 Jan 2007
- 26 Feb 2010 - 31 Jul 2010
- project design document
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- Appendix 1 - PDD with track changes
- validation report of revised monitoring plan
- DNV Validation Report and Protocol

Report ID: CM-20A17398 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-03-27 · Generated: 2026-04-01

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