

QUALITY REPORT

Oeste de Caucaia Landfill Project

VCS-2600 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-0C459A09 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the extracted record, which supports basic credibility. However, leakage is not addressed and there are major inconsistencies in claimed vs verified emission reductions across documents, increasing over-crediting and reliability concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2600
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2020
Project Methodology	ACM0001 15.0.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2023
VVB	KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	1,081,131 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large contradictions in emission reduction numbers between the validation report (2021-05-20) and an earlier monitoring report (2021-03-12)
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record
- Safeguards documentation is inconsistent (one source indicates safeguards are mentioned, another indicates they are not)

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test.
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record, weakening the completeness of the GHG accounting.

The validation report (2021-05-20) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which supports additionality robustness. The monitoring record shows a project-specific baseline approach under ACM0001, but the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record. Leakage is explicitly not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, which is a material integrity gap for complete accounting. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is supportive but does not resolve the leakage and consistency issues.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

- + A named VVB (KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.) and a defined monitoring period (2020-09-24 to 2020-12-31) are provided in the monitoring documentation.
- Key results (claimed/verified ERs) are contradictory across documents, reducing confidence in the MRV trail.

The monitoring report (2021-05-19) provides a clear monitoring period (2020-09-24 to 2020-12-31) and identifies the VVB as KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd. However, the extracted record contains major inconsistencies in both claimed and verified emission reductions between the validation report (2021-05-20) and an earlier monitoring report (2021-03-12), which undermines transparency and traceability of results. Several MRV-relevant fields (such as usage monitoring method) are not stated in the extracted record, limiting replicability of calculations.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.
- Contradictory ER figures and missing leakage treatment elevate over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of higher-stakes aviation claims. Nonetheless, the large contradictions in emission reduction quantities across documents increase the risk of over-crediting or miscommunication of outcomes to buyers. Leakage is not addressed and no deduction is stated, which further increases the risk that credited reductions are overstated. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

- + Multiple document types are present (validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence and 11 documents used.
- One cited source is "unknown" and safeguards information conflicts across documents, indicating record quality issues.

The extracted record references multiple document types (validation report, monitoring report) and indicates 11 documents were used with high extraction confidence, supporting document completeness. The most recent extracted document date is 2021-05-19 (monitoring report), which is reasonably aligned with the monitoring period end in 2020. However, one evidence source is labeled "unknown" (dated 2022-04-01) and it conflicts with the monitoring report on whether safeguards are mentioned, which reduces confidence in the documentation set. The absence of stated baseline reassessment timing and missing leakage quantification also indicate documentation gaps on key quality topics.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined additionality test
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced in extracted record
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed; no deduction stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced and inconsistent across sources
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled ER table that clearly explains scope and period alignment across validation/monitoring documents and resolves the claimed/verified ER contradictions.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment and, if applicable, a quantified leakage deduction with justification consistent with the applied methodology.

→ Disclose safeguards evidence (FPIC, grievance mechanism, stakeholder consultation outcomes) in a clearly attributable document and ensure consistency across the project record.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Validation Report
- 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-0C459A09 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy