

QUALITY REPORT

Consórcio Horizonte Asja

GS-541 · GS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-0866DED1 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.7

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	3.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.6
■ Documentation (15%)	3.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signs, including an investment-test additionality claim and no material findings in the available PDD. However, key safeguards and MRV details are missing, leakage is not really justified, and the record is limited to a PDD rather than a verification package. Overall, this is a low-to-moderate confidence crediting case with meaningful evidence gaps.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-541
Sector	biogas
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0001 Version 11
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage is set at 0% but the justification is marked as not addressed.
- No VVB confirmation, monitoring period, or verified issuance figures were found in the available record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- + The PDD states an investment-test additionality approach under ACM0001, which is a recognized additionality route.
- Leakage is shown as 0% while the justification is not addressed, and reversal risk is also not addressed in the available documents.

The PDD describes additionality through an investment test under ACM0001 Version 11, which supports the project's core crediting logic. But leakage is recorded as 0% with no real justification, and reversal risk is not addressed, which weakens the permanence and baseline confidence. No material findings or corrective actions were reported in the available PDD, but there is no VVB confirmation in the extracted record.

Transparency — 3.1 / 10

- + The project identifies the methodology as ACM0001 Version 11 and provides a crediting period in the PDD.
- No monitoring report, VVB name, or verified emission reduction figures were found, limiting public MRV transparency.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record contains only the PDD and no monitoring report or verification statement. The project names the methodology and crediting period, but the VVB name, monitoring period, and verified issuance totals are not found in available documents. The grid emission factor is stated, yet the broader MRV trail is incomplete.

Claim Safety — 3.6 / 10

- + The project is not shown to have double registration or double issuance in the extracted record.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed baseline, and leakage treatment is weakly supported.

Claim safety is weakened by the project-specific baseline and the lack of a documented leakage rationale. The record does not show CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval, and there is no evidence of double registration or double issuance in the extracted facts. Still, the absence of verified monitoring data and the weak leakage treatment increase over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 3.4 / 10

- + The PDD is dated and includes a defined crediting period, with two evidence documents used in extraction.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the available record is sparse, with many key fields not stated in the documents.

Documentation quality is modest at best: the record relies mainly on a single PDD dated 2012-10-03, with only two evidence documents used in extraction. The extraction confidence is medium, but many important fields are not stated in the available documents, including monitoring details, VVB identity, and verified issuance figures. That leaves substantial uncertainty around how the project performed in practice.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test stated, not VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	Reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Zero deduction without justification
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	Grievance and benefit sharing noted, FPIC not stated
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verification report and monitoring report with VVB identity, verified issuance totals, and monitoring-period details.

→ Document leakage and permanence treatment explicitly, including the rationale for the 0% leakage deduction and any buffer or reversal provisions.

Documents Reviewed

- GS Passport_30-06-15.pdf
- PDD_03-10-12.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-541
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-541

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-0866DED1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy