

QUALITY REPORT

Salto Pilão Hydropower Plant Project Activity

VCS-513 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-F8C76585 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.8
	Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%	

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality via an investment test and uses an established grid-connected renewable methodology (ACM0002), but the extracted record shows major inconsistencies in reported and verified emission reductions across documents. Leakage treatment is unclear and frequently not evidenced, and numerous corrective actions point to recurring MRV and calculation weaknesses, increasing over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-513
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2020 — 2030
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	229,534 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	41 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large contradictions in emission reduction figures across monitoring/validation documents (claimed and verified totals differ materially).
- Leakage is inconsistently treated (validation deems negligible, later monitoring record shows leakage not addressed) with no quantified deduction found.
- Extensive corrective actions (including grid emission factor revisions and metering inconsistencies) indicate MRV/calculation reliability issues.
- Crediting period dates conflict across monitoring reports, raising concerns about boundary/period consistency.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.6 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Numerous corrective actions in monitoring/verification materials (e.g., grid emission factor revisions, net generation corrections, metering inconsistencies) suggest elevated risk of baseline/MRV errors affecting credited volumes.

The validation/verification record confirms additionality via an investment test, as reflected in the extracted data and VVB attribution (Earthood Services Private Limited). However, the monitoring/verification trail includes many corrective actions—such as revisions to grid emission factors, corrections to net electricity generation, and observed metering location inconsistencies during a site visit—indicating weaknesses in MRV implementation that can directly affect baseline emissions and credited ERs. Leakage is not robustly handled in the extracted record: no leakage deduction percentage is found, and later monitoring information indicates leakage was not addressed, which is conservative but signals incomplete integrity treatment.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

- + Key project identifiers and MRV elements are present (VCS registry, methodology ACM0002 v20.0, VVB named, monitoring period stated).
- Material contradictions in claimed/verified ERs and crediting period dates reduce confidence that public-facing numbers are consistently reported.

The extracted record provides core MRV descriptors (methodology ACM0002 version 20.0, monitoring period 2020-01-19 to 2021-10-31, VVB name, and a substantial set of evidence document types). Transparency is undermined by major inconsistencies in reported ER quantities across different documents and dates, and by conflicting crediting period statements across monitoring reports. The presence of many corrective actions also suggests that earlier public numbers may have been revised materially, making it harder for third parties to reconcile figures.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream double-claiming risks.
- Over-crediting risk is elevated due to inconsistent ER totals and repeated corrections to emission factors and generation data.

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of certain aviation-related double-claiming channels. Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened by the large spread between claimed and verified ER figures across documents and by repeated corrections to key inputs (grid emission factors and generation data) noted in corrective actions, both of which increase perceived over-crediting/greenwashing risk. Leakage treatment is inconsistent between validation and later monitoring records, adding uncertainty to the completeness of the credited impact claims.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ A relatively broad document set is referenced (monitoring report, validation report, PDD, issuance) with high extraction confidence and many documents used.

- The record contains multiple internal inconsistencies across documents (ER totals, safeguards/FPIC/grievance statements, crediting period), indicating documentation quality/control issues.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong in breadth (monitoring report, validation report, PDD, and issuance are all referenced; 27 documents used; extraction confidence is high). However, the internal consistency of the documentation set is poor: safeguards/FPIC/grievance and benefit-sharing statements vary across monitoring reports, and key quantitative outcomes (claimed/verified ERs) conflict across validation/monitoring sources. The volume and nature of corrective actions further indicate that document versions and calculations required repeated fixes, lowering confidence in document control and reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not consistently addressed
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reporting inconsistent
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation table across document versions showing claimed vs verified ERs by monitoring period, with reasons for changes and final issued volumes.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment consistent across validation and monitoring (including justification and, where applicable, a quantified deduction).

Documents Reviewed

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

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-F8C76585 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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