

QUALITY REPORT

# Caixa Econômica Federal Solid Waste Management and Car...

CNN-c65d6d · CAR · Brazil

Report ID: CM-D0F8F9DB · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

## Assessment Summary

This is an avoidance project using ACM0001 with VVB involvement and no reported material findings, which supports basic credibility. However, key integrity and MRV elements (additionality test type, leakage treatment, baseline reassessment timing, and verified ERs) are not stated in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CNN-c65d6d
Sector	industrial
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2008, 2012, 2013
Project Methodology	ACM0001 19.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2026
VVB	KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Verified emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, while claimed ERs are reported (208,242), limiting confidence in issued/verified volumes.
- Leakage treatment is not stated (no deduction percentage and no justification found), despite being important for waste management projects.
- Additionality is said to be confirmed by the VVB, but the specific additionality test type is not stated in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The monitoring documentation reports no material findings and no corrective actions required (monitoring report, 2023).
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2023).

The project applies ACM0001 (version 19.0) with a project-specific baseline approach, but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2023). Additionality is indicated as confirmed by the VVB, yet the specific additionality test type is not stated, weakening the ability to judge robustness (validation/monitoring documentation). Leakage is not quantified and no justification is found in the extracted record, which is a material integrity gap for waste-sector accounting (monitoring report, 2023).

### Transparency — 5.0 / 10

- + A VVB is identified (KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.) and a defined monitoring period is provided (monitoring report, 2023).
- The verified ER total is not stated in the extracted record, preventing a claimed-versus-verified cross-check (monitoring report, 2023).

The monitoring period (2020-03-03 to 2020-12-31) and the VVB name (KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.) are clearly provided (monitoring report, 2023). However, the extracted record does not state the verified ER total, so the claimed 208,242 tCO<sub>2</sub>e cannot be reconciled against verification outcomes here (monitoring report, 2023). Several MRV-relevant items (e.g., usage monitoring method, fossil fraction method/value) are also not stated in the extracted record, reducing transparency of calculations (monitoring report, 2023).

### Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (monitoring report, 2023).
- Leakage and key parameter substantiation (e.g., fossil fraction method/value) are not stated in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk (monitoring report, 2023).

CORSIA eligibility is explicitly false, which reduces the risk of higher-stakes aviation claims being made from these credits (monitoring report, 2023). At the same time, over-crediting risk remains because leakage treatment is not stated and key methodological parameters (e.g., fossil fraction method/value) are not found in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2023). The baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, which can increase the chance that the baseline is outdated relative to sector practice (monitoring report, 2023).

### Documentation — 6.6 / 10

- + Core document types are present (validation report and monitoring report) with high extraction confidence (document set).
- Several critical fields are missing from the extracted record (e.g., additionality test type, leakage deduction/justification, verified ERs), indicating incomplete accessible evidence (document set).

The evidence set includes at least a validation report and a monitoring report, and extraction confidence is high, supporting basic document reliability (document set). The monitoring report is relatively recent (dated 2023-11-17) and reports no material findings or corrective actions required (monitoring report, 2023). Nonetheless, multiple critical quantitative and methodological details are not stated in the extracted record (notably verified ERs, leakage deduction/justification, and additionality test type), indicating documentation incompleteness for quality assessment (document set).

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed, but test type not stated
● <b>Permanence</b>	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not stated
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	No FPIC or grievance mechanism evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the verification outcome for the monitoring period, including the verified ER total and any calculation adjustments relative to the 208,242 tCO<sub>2</sub>e claimed.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment (justification and any deduction) and the key ACM0001 parameter methods/values (e.g., fossil fraction method/value) used for ER quantification.

→ Document social safeguards: evidence of stakeholder consultation/FPIC where applicable and a functioning grievance mechanism.

## Documents Reviewed

- 03 Mar 2020 - 31 Dec 2020
- approval
- 05 Oct 2019 - 02 Mar 2020
- Signed form.pdf
- 20191226\_CEF\_PoA-DD\_v.3.pdf
- FVR\_PoA\_Caixa.pdf

### 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-D0F8F9DB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy