

QUALITY REPORT

Methane Recovery Project Praktijkcentrum Sterksel, North Brabant, The Netherlands

VCS-338 · VCS · Netherlands

Report ID: CM-A8021C28 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.7Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	3.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS methane recovery project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record has low extraction confidence, limited monitoring detail, and several contradictions across documents, so the evidence base is not strong enough for a high-confidence claim.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-338
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Netherlands
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS III.D, AMS I.C 11, 09
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.
Verified ERs	36,031 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2008 — 2016
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The extracted record shows a major discrepancy in verified emission reductions, with one document set indicating 6,421 and a later one indicating 36,031; this raises reliability concerns.
- Leakage treatment is only described as negligible in one source, while an earlier document reportedly did not address leakage, and key monitoring details are missing.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project used a barrier test, which is a positive sign for project justification.
- The baseline is project-specific and the last reassessment date is not stated; leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, and no buffer pool information is available.

The verification report indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project used a barrier test, which supports the project rationale. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, but the baseline is project-specific and the reassessment timing is not stated, while leakage treatment is only described as negligible in one source and not addressed in an earlier one.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The project has a named verifier, AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U., and the monitoring period and crediting period are both identified.
- Total verified emission reductions conflict sharply across documents, and usage monitoring details are not stated in the extracted record.

The record identifies the verifier as AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U. and provides both the monitoring period and the crediting period. Transparency is weakened by missing monitoring-method detail, no stated usage-rate evidence, and a large discrepancy in verified emission reductions between document sets, which reduces confidence in the public record.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, leakage justification is only partly supported, and the large discrepancy in verified reductions weakens confidence in the claimed climate benefit.

Claim safety is helped by the project being marked not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-claim exposure. Still, the project relies on a project-specific baseline, leakage justification is only partially supported, and the contradiction in verified emission reductions suggests possible over-crediting or at least inconsistent reporting.

Documentation — 3.4 / 10

- + The record includes multiple official-document extractions and no material findings or corrective actions were reported.
- Extraction confidence is low, the evidence-doc list is not informative, and several important fields such as buffer pool, leakage deduction, and monitoring method are not stated.

Documentation quality is limited by low extraction confidence and an uninformative evidence-doc list. Although the record spans multiple documents and reports no material findings, key items such as buffer pool coverage, leakage deduction, and monitoring methodology are not stated, which leaves important evidence gaps.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Avoidance project, but buffer coverage not stated
● Leakage	Negligible leakage claimed, but not consistently addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	Grievance mechanism present, FPIC not found
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible and no CCP approval stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clean, reconciled MRV package showing the correct verified emission reductions and explaining the discrepancy between document versions.

→ Disclose the monitoring methodology, leakage treatment, buffer pool status, and any safeguard procedures in a single current verification or monitoring report.

Documents Reviewed

- PP_ISS_REP_338_02MAR2010.pdf
- VCS 338 Issuance Representation.pdf
- MONIT_REP_338_01MAY2006_31DEC2007.pdf
- VCS Monitoring Report_Sterksel_v002_2008-2016.pdf
- PPRP Database Placeholder Template.doc
- Registration Representation
- 334-338, GES Energie GmbH, Exemption Approval.pdf
- A_070_Sterksel_FINAL_DeterminationProtocol_27082007.pdf
- VCS 338 signed-Registration-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1 (1).pdf
- A_070_Sterksel_FINAL_PDD_28062007.pdf
- Sterksel_PDD_Addendum_VCS_public.pdf
- VALID REP 338 31JUL2007.pdf
- VCS_338 Sterksel Project_Verification_Representation_20210405.pdf
- VCS 338 Sterkel Project VR v2.pdf
- VERIF_REP_338_24FEB2009_25MAY2009.pdf

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-A8021C28 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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