QUALITY REPORT

Dori Alimentos Ltda - Biomass Based Project - Brazil

VCS-332 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-1299340A · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10		
	Integrity (35%)	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.1
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
	Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS biomass fuel-switching project has VVB-confirmed additionality and no reversals reported, but the record shows multiple internal inconsistencies across document versions. The large swing in reported verified/claimed emission reductions and numerous corrective action requests raise over-crediting and data-reliability concerns despite generally good document availability.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-332
Sector	biomass
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS-I.C 20.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2026
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A.
Verified ERs	47,286 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	33 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Large discrepancy in reported verified/claimed emission reductions between validation report versions (22,925 vs 47,286).
- ■ Extensive corrective action requests indicate monitoring/calculation and methodology-application weaknesses (including recalculation required under AMS-I.C).
- ■ Key sustainability and stakeholder safeguards (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) appear in later monitoring but are absent in earlier monitoring, suggesting inconsistent disclosure.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is stated as confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test (monitoring report, 2025).

- Corrective action requests cite risks that emission reductions cannot be monitored/calculated and require recalculation under AMS-I.C (monitoring report, 2025).

The monitoring report (2025) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test, which supports additionality. However, the same monitoring report lists many corrective action requests, including concerns that emission reductions may not be monitorable/calculable and that emission reductions must be recalculated according to AMS-I.C, which weakens confidence in baseline/quantification integrity. Leakage is reported with a 0% deduction alongside a statement that leakage was quantified (monitoring report, 2025), but the basis for arriving at zero is not evidenced in the extracted record. No reversals are reported, which is consistent with an avoidance project type and lowers permanence risk.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ Core project/assurance details are present, including VVB name (RINA) and a defined monitoring period (2020–2023) (monitoring report, 2025).

- Multiple contradictions across document vintages (ERR totals, safeguards, crediting period) reduce confidence in the public record's consistency.

The extracted record includes the VVB (RINA Services S.p.A.), monitoring period (2020-08-01 to 2023-12-31), and matching claimed vs verified totals for the latest cycle (47,286) (monitoring/validation documents, 2025). At the same time, the project file shows repeated contradictions across earlier vs later document versions (e.g., ERR totals, safeguards, crediting period), which reduces transparency because users cannot easily reconcile which figures and statements govern. Key MRV elements such as grid emission factor details and usage monitoring method are not found in the extracted record, limiting independent reproducibility.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ Not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (registry extract).

- Over-crediting risk signaled by ERR discrepancies and CARs requiring rounding down and recalculation of emission reductions (validation/monitoring documents, 2021–2025).

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation claims (registry extract). Nonetheless, the validation report figures conflict across vintages (22,925 in 2021 vs 47,286 in 2025), and the monitoring report (2025) includes CARs requiring rounding down and recalculation of emission reductions under AMS-I.C—both of which elevate over-crediting/greenwashing risk if not clearly resolved. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Broad document set used (PDD, monitoring, validation, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 25 documents referenced (extracted record).

- Numerous corrective action requests indicate documentation/QA gaps in the monitoring and calculation evidence package (monitoring report, 2025).

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the evidence set includes PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance, with 25 documents used and high extraction confidence (extracted record). However, the monitoring report (2025) lists extensive corrective action requests spanning project description consistency, biomass sourcing clarity, parameter/table issues, and calculation spreadsheet requirements, indicating that the documentation package had material quality-control gaps at the time of review. Several important fields (e.g., baseline reassessment timing, grid EF year/value) are not found in the extracted record, which limits completeness.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed in latest report, but inconsistent across vintages
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● **Leakage**	0% deduction with shifting justification across reports
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not evidenced
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards reported later but absent in earlier monitoring
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note explaining the change in verified/claimed emission reductions between the 2021 and 2025 validation report versions, including what changed (data, boundary, methodology application, rounding).

→ Provide a consolidated, updated monitoring/calculation package that explicitly closes the listed corrective action requests (especially AMS-I.C equation/calc corrections and monthly biomass monitoring evidence) and documents the leakage quantification leading to a 0% deduction.

Documents Reviewed

• Issuance Representation
• Monitoring Report
• Registration Review Report
• 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-1299340A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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