

## QUALITY REPORT

# Brascarbon Methane Recovery Project BCA-BRA-16

VCS-2998 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-A49C15AC · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.9**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.4</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.6</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.2</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS methane recovery project with VVB-confirmed investment-test additionality and no material findings reported in the monitoring record. However, several key items are weakly documented or inconsistent, especially leakage treatment, the absence of a stated usage-monitoring method, and conflicting figures and safeguard statements across documents.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2998
Sector	biogas
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2021, 2022, 2023
Project Methodology	AMS-III.D 21.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2028
VVB	ICONTEC
Verified ERs	99,467 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	16 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

## Red Flags

- Leakage is inconsistently described: the monitoring report says it was not addressed, while the validation report later says it was deemed negligible.
- The verified emission reduction total differs across validation documents, and the project's public claim-safety signals are incomplete because CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.4 / 10

- + The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test, and the VVB named as ICONTEC verified it.
- Leakage treatment is weakly supported because the monitoring report says it was not addressed, even though a later validation report calls it negligible.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the validation report confirms additionality through an investment test, and ICONTEC is identified as the VVB. The monitoring report also reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. That said, leakage handling is not robustly documented: the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed, while a later validation report says it was deemed negligible, so the evidence is mixed.

### Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + The monitoring report provides a defined monitoring period and a verified emission reduction total of 99,467 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.
- The usage-monitoring method is not stated, and CORSIA eligibility is not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring report states a clear monitoring period from 2022-02-01 to 2023-12-31 and reports 99,467 verified emission reductions. However, the usage-monitoring method is not stated in the extracted record, and CORSIA eligibility is also not found. The absence of a claimed total in the extracted facts limits reconciliation of claimed versus verified issuance.

### Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline under AMS-III.D, which is at least a defined methodology rather than an absent baseline.
- Claim safety is weakened by the leakage inconsistency and by missing information on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, and verified usage rates.

Claim safety is middling because the project uses a recognized methodology, AMS-III.D, and a project baseline is identified. Still, the leakage inconsistency creates over-crediting risk, and the record does not provide verified usage rates or a clear public eligibility status for CORSIA or CCP. The project therefore cannot be treated as low-risk for dual-market or over-claim concerns.

### Documentation — 6.1 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence.
- The record still has important gaps, including no buffer pool percentage, no baseline reassessment date, and no quantified usage monitoring.

Documentation quality is fair but incomplete. The record draws on multiple official documents, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials, and extraction confidence is high. Even so, several important fields are missing or not quantified, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and usage monitoring details, which weakens the completeness of the evidence base.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	no buffer pool stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	inconsistent leakage treatment
● <b>Baseline</b>	project baseline stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled emissions and leakage table that explains the difference between the earlier and later validation figures and clearly documents the final credited amount.

→ Provide explicit usage-monitoring methodology, buffer pool treatment, and a clear statement on CORSIA eligibility and CCP status.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Validation 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-A49C15AC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)