

QUALITY REPORT

Rondinha Small Hydroelectric Power Plant

CNN-edc0d2 · Gold Standard · Brazil

Report ID: CM-AA20EFD5 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected small hydro project using a well-established CDM methodology, with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no reported material findings. However, key quantification elements (notably leakage treatment and verified ERs) are missing from the extracted record, and safeguards documentation is inconsistent across documents, which increases uncertainty and weakens claim confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-edc0d2
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2013
Project Methodology	ACM0002 14.0
Crediting Period	2015 — 2021
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A.
Monitoring Period	2015 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, while claimed ERs are reported (89,634 tCO₂e).
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, despite being a required integrity check under methodology application.
- Safeguards coverage is contradictory between the monitoring report and the PDD, and FPIC/grievance mechanism are reported as absent.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Leakage is not addressed and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record.

The validation/verification documentation indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (validation report). The baseline is project-specific under ACM0002 (monitoring report), but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record. Leakage is flagged as not addressed (monitoring report) and no leakage deduction is provided, which weakens integrity assurance even for a renewable electricity project. No material findings or corrective actions are reported (monitoring report), which is a positive signal but does not substitute for missing quantified checks.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + A defined monitoring/crediting period is provided (2015–2021) and a named VVB (RINA Services S.p.A.) is identified.
- The extracted record lacks the verified ER total and key calculation inputs (e.g., grid emission factor), limiting MRV transparency.

The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period (2015-01-01 to 2021-12-31) and identifies the VVB as RINA Services S.p.A. (monitoring report). However, the extracted record includes claimed ERs (89,634 tCO₂e) but does not include the verified ER total, making it difficult to confirm what was actually issued/verified (monitoring report). Key calculation inputs such as the grid emission factor value are also not found in the extracted record, despite a grid EF year being referenced (monitoring report).

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

- + The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream aviation-claim risks.
- Over-crediting risk is harder to rule out because verified ERs are not found and leakage treatment is missing.

The project is explicitly stated as not CORSIA-eligible (monitoring report), which lowers the risk of aviation-related double-claim pathways. Still, claim safety is constrained by the absence of verified ER totals in the extracted record and by missing leakage treatment, both of which increase over-crediting uncertainty (monitoring report). CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on CCP screening as an external quality filter here.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

- + Multiple core document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, financial) with medium extraction confidence.
- Safeguards information is inconsistent across documents and several key fields are not found in the extracted record.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and financial documentation, with seven documents used and medium extraction confidence (extracted record). Several important fields are not found in the extracted record (e.g., verified ERs, grid emission factor value, leakage deduction), indicating incomplete extractable detail for independent review. Social safeguards elements appear weakly documented: FPIC and a grievance mechanism are reported as absent (extracted record), and safeguards coverage is inconsistent across documents.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed; no deduction stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance absent; safeguards inconsistent
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the verified ER total for 2015–2021 and provide a clear reconciliation between claimed and verified ERs in the verification/monitoring package.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment and (if applicable) a quantified leakage deduction consistent with ACM0002 application, plus the underlying justification.

→ Clarify safeguards implementation with documented FPIC (where relevant), a functioning grievance mechanism, and consistent safeguards reporting across the PDD and monitoring/verification documents.

Documents Reviewed

- Appendix 2 - ER spreadsheet_Rondinha
- 01 Jan 2015 - 31 Dec 2020
- registration request form
- approval
- 01 Jan 2021 - 31 Dec 2021
- Appendix 1 - Investment analysis_Rondinha
- Validation opinion on changes in PDD
- project design document
- Validation 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-AA20EFD5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy