QUALITY REPORT

Baesa Project

VCS-10 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-F09F1801 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9 Overall Score out of 10		
	Integrity (35%)	5.4
	Transparency (25%)	4.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.9
	Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported reversal events, but the evidence is weakened by unresolved leakage treatment and several corrective actions in the monitoring report. Claim safety is limited by a large gap between claimed and verified emissions reductions and by contradictory documentation on crediting period and leakage treatment.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-10
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2013, 2014
Project Methodology	ACM0002 7
Crediting Period	2006 — 2015
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	2,349,038 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	25 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while an earlier validation report says it was quantified.
- There is a major gap between claimed reductions and verified reductions, and the documents contain conflicting figures across validation reports.
- The monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including outdated emission factors and inconsistencies in raw data and units.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using an investment test and confirmed by the VVB, which supports the project case.

- Leakage treatment is weakly supported: the monitoring report says it was not addressed, even though a validation report reportedly quantified it.

The project's additionality is relatively strong because the validation report confirms an investment test and the VVB is identified as Earthood Services Private Limited. Permanence risk appears limited because this is an avoidance project and no reversal events were reported, but the record does not provide a buffer pool percentage. Integrity is weakened by the leakage treatment: the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while a validation report reportedly quantified it, so I treat the more recent monitoring report as the more operationally relevant source and score this conservatively.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a substantial set of source documents used in the extraction.

- The monitoring report includes several corrective actions and inconsistencies, including missing report version/date and unit errors, which reduce reporting clarity.

Transparency is mixed. The record includes a named VVB, a monitoring period, and multiple official documents, which helps traceability. However, the monitoring report lists several corrective actions, including missing version/date information, a unit error, and inconsistencies between raw data and the spreadsheet, which reduce confidence in the MRV trail. The extraction confidence is high, so I did not penalize documentation for readability issues.

Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

- Claimed reductions of 4,586,251 are far above verified reductions of 2,349,038, indicating a material over-claim risk.

- The project is not CORSIA-eligible, but the contradictory leakage and crediting-period records still weaken confidence in the claim.

Claim safety is weak because the verified emissions reductions are much lower than the claimed amount, which suggests a substantial over-crediting risk. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of market risk, but the contradictory treatment of leakage and the conflicting emissions-reduction figures still undermine confidence in the claimed climate benefit. I privilege the later verified figure for the emissions outcome because it is the more recent validation result.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ Multiple official document types were available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records.

- The monitoring report is dated 2020-08-12 while the crediting period in that report is already historical, and the record contains several documented inconsistencies requiring correction.

Documentation is moderately complete because the extraction drew on validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, with 25 documents used. The VVB is named and extraction confidence is high, which supports reliability. Still, the monitoring report contains multiple corrective actions and the crediting-period information is inconsistent across documents, so the documentation is not fully clean or internally consistent.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● **Leakage**	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● **Baseline**	Project baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions table that explains the gap between claimed and verified reductions and resolves the conflicting validation figures.

→ Publish a clear leakage assessment and updated monitoring documentation with corrected versioning, units, and the latest emission factor source.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report

Report ID: CM-F09F1801 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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