QUALITY REPORT

Balsas Renewable Energy Project

GS-167 · GS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-B8214B89 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.4
Transparency (25%)	5.8
Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, quantified leakage treatment, and no reported reversal events. However, the record also shows multiple corrective actions, a project-specific baseline, and important data gaps around permanence and usage monitoring, which keep confidence moderate rather than strong.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-167
Sector	biomass
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.E version 05
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
VVB	IBOPE Instituto Brasileiro de Opinião Pública e Estatística Ltda.
Verified ERs	19,376 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2014
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Six corrective action requests were raised in the verification report, indicating notable documentation or implementation issues.
- Key monitoring details are missing or inconsistent, including the usage rate and permanence treatment, and the FNRB value differs sharply between the monitoring report and the PDD.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the verification report, and the project used a barrier test rather than relying only on self-assertion.

- The verification report lists six corrective action requests, and permanence is not well evidenced because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool share is stated.

The verification report confirms additionality through a barrier test and states that leakage was quantified with a 0% deduction. On the negative side, the report also lists six corrective action requests, and permanence is weakly documented because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is available.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ The record includes a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and both monitoring and verification documents in the evidence set.

- Several core MRV fields are missing, including the verified usage rate and the monitoring method for usage, and the extraction confidence is only medium.

Transparency is helped by the presence of a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and multiple official source documents. Still, key MRV details are missing in the extracted record, including the verified usage rate and the usage monitoring method, and the extraction confidence is only medium, which limits trust in completeness.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ Leakage was explicitly quantified with a 0% deduction in the verification report, which is better than an unqualified assumption.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized or recently reassessed, and the FNRB value is inconsistent across documents, with the monitoring report far below the PDD figure.

Claim safety is moderate because the project has a quantified leakage treatment and a VVB-reviewed verification record. However, the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, and the FNRB value is inconsistent across documents: the monitoring report shows 0.8683 while the PDD shows 84.5, so I privileged the more recent monitoring report but discounted confidence because of the contradiction.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ The evidence set spans multiple official documents, including the PDD, monitoring report, verification report, stakeholder consultation, and issuance record.

- The verification report required six corrective actions, and the crediting period dates differ between the PDD and monitoring report, which reduces documentation reliability.

Documentation breadth is decent because the evidence set includes the PDD, monitoring report, verification report, stakeholder consultation, and issuance record, with 12 documents used overall. The score is held back by six corrective actions in the verification report, medium extraction confidence, and a date inconsistency in the crediting period between the PDD and monitoring report, which suggests the record is not fully clean.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
Permanence	No buffer pool stated
Leakage	Leakage quantified at 0%
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment unclear
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear, reconciled MRV package that resolves the FNRB and crediting-period contradictions and states the verified usage rate and monitoring method.

→ Provide explicit permanence treatment, including buffer pool allocation or other reversal safeguards, and close out or explain the six corrective action requests in the verification report.

Documents Reviewed

- GS1291 Issuance Review Period_1st MP_11.05.2015.doc
- GS1291 Issuance Review Period_1st MP_16.03.2015.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.12.2011 to 01.09.2014_v5.docx
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.12.2011 to 01.09.2014_v5.docx
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.12.2011 to 01.09.2014_v3.pdf
- GS1291 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report_04.07.2013_v2.pdf
- PDD 10.08.2012_v1.pdf
- PDD 10.09.2013_v9.pdf
- PDD 21.01.2014_v12.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-167
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-167
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01.12.2011 to 30.09.2014_v3.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01.12.2011 to 30.09.2014_v1.pdf
- (2)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01.12.2011 to 30.09.2014_v3.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-B8214B89 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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