

QUALITY REPORT

BUENOS AIRES RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT

GS-309 · Gold Standard · Brazil

Report ID: CM-C6399011 · Generated: 2026-04-11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
■ Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some solid quality signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage treatment, and no material findings in the verification report. However, the crediting record shows a major discrepancy between claimed and verified emissions reductions, and several key MRV details are not stated in the extracted documents. Overall, this looks moderately credible but with meaningful reliability and over-crediting concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-309
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2016, 2017, 2018, 2019
Project Methodology	AMS-I.E 5.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2019
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	30,550 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-11

Red Flags

- Verified emissions reductions are far below the amount claimed, with 30,550 verified versus 148,737 claimed.
- The project record contains multiple contradictions across validation, monitoring, and verification documents, including FPIC, grievance mechanism, and additionality basis.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the verification report cites a barrier test.

- The verified emissions figure is much lower than the claimed amount, and the record includes a contradiction on the additionality basis.

The verification report dated 2018-04-13 confirms additionality through a barrier test and reports no material findings, which supports the project's core integrity. Leakage is treated as quantified, but the extracted record does not state the deduction percentage, and the baseline is only described as project-based rather than recently reassessed. The large gap between claimed and verified reductions weakens confidence in the crediting outcome.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier, Earthood Services Private Limited, and a defined monitoring period from 2017-09-01 to 2019-12-31.

- Key MRV details such as the usage monitoring method, baseline reassessment timing, and grid emission factor are not stated in available documents.

Transparency is helped by the presence of a named VVB, Earthood Services Private Limited, and a clearly defined monitoring period from 2017-09-01 to 2019-12-31. However, several important MRV fields are not stated in available documents, including the usage monitoring method, baseline reassessment date, and grid emission factor. The record also shows a corrective action because the SD indicators in the MR annex did not match the registered GS Passport.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

+ Leakage is described as quantified in the verification report, which is better than leaving it unaddressed.

- The gap between claimed and verified emissions reductions raises over-crediting risk, and CORSIA or CCP status is not stated.

Claim safety is constrained by the discrepancy between 148,737 claimed emissions reductions and 30,550 verified, which suggests substantial over-crediting risk. The project is Gold Standard certified and uses an avoidance methodology, but CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record. Leakage is at least addressed, but the missing deduction percentage limits confidence.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

+ The record draws on multiple official documents, including validation, monitoring, verification, PDD, and appendix materials.

- One corrective action was required, and the extracted record notes a document inconsistency between the MR annex and the registered GS Passport.

Documentation is reasonably broad, with evidence drawn from validation, monitoring, verification, PDD, appendix, and other official materials, and extraction confidence is high. Even so, one corrective action was required, and the record contains several contradictions across documents, including FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, and additionality basis. The crediting period extends to 2019-12-31, which is reasonably recent relative to the monitoring period, but the documentation is not fully clean or internally consistent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Avoidance project, no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage quantified but deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present, but contradictory reco
● Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the full leakage calculation, baseline reassessment history, and usage monitoring method in a single reconciled MRV package.

→ Resolve the claimed-versus-verified emissions discrepancy and the document contradictions on FPIC, grievance mechanism, and additionality basis.

Documents Reviewed

- (2)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.03.2012 to 31.08.2017_v6.pdf
- (2)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.03.2012 to 31.08.2017_v1.pdf
- MR_Buenos Aires_period 2_01 09 2017_31 12 2019_v.06.2.pdf
- Monitoring Report
- Transition Annex_27.11.2014.pdf
- T-V4.0-Deviation-Request-Form_BuenosAires_GS2290_GSdecision.pdf
- LSC Report_Buenos Aires Renewable Energy Project_v4.0.pdf
- T-V4.0-Deviation-Request-Form_BuenosAires_GS2290_GSdecision(1).pdf
- (1)GS Passport 18.11.2013_v5.pdf
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-309
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-309
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01.03.2012 to 31.08.2017_v1.pdf
- GS2290 Validation Report_13.11.2017_v1.pdf
- GS.VER.19.168.FVeR_Cleaned_Approved.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01.03.2012 to 31.08.2017_v2.pdf
- 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-C6399011 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-11 · Generated: 2026-04-11

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