

QUALITY REPORT

CATANDUVA LANDFILL GAS PROJECT

VCS-5436 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-0FA0D700 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

This landfill gas project has some strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a stated project baseline, and no reported material findings. However, key evidence gaps remain around leakage justification, monitoring detail, and reversal handling, and the validation report still lists multiple corrective actions, which weakens confidence in the documentation package.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-5436
Sector	methane
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0001 19.0
Crediting Period	2023 — 2030
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Leakage is set at 0% but the validation report says it is not addressed, creating a credibility gap.
- Four corrective actions remain listed in the validation report, suggesting unresolved documentation or methodology issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses ACM0001 under the VCS registry.
- Leakage justification is not addressed in the validation report, and reversal handling is also not addressed.

The validation report confirms additionality through VVB review, and the project uses a project baseline under ACM0001, which supports the core crediting logic. That said, leakage is recorded as 0% while the same report says leakage justification is not addressed, and reversal events are also not addressed, so permanence and leakage robustness are only moderate. The presence of four corrective actions further reduces confidence in the robustness of the underlying accounting.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The project is on the VCS registry and the validation report identifies the verifier as LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification).
- Total ERs claimed and verified are not stated in the extracted record, and the monitoring period is not found.

Transparency is mixed because the project is on the VCS registry and the verifier is named, but key MRV outputs are missing from the extracted record. Total ERs claimed and verified are not stated, the monitoring period is not found, and the usage monitoring method is also absent. This limits the ability to independently check issuance and performance claims.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

- + The project is not described as CCP-approved, which avoids one channel of claim overlap.
- CORSIA eligibility is true, so the project may still face dual-claim scrutiny, and the leakage treatment is weak.

Claim safety is weakened by the combination of CORSIA eligibility and incomplete leakage treatment. The project is not shown to be CCP-approved, which avoids one specific overlap risk, but CORSIA eligibility means the credit may still be used in a higher-scrutiny claims context. Because the validation report says leakage is not addressed, over-crediting risk is not fully controlled.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + The record includes multiple evidence documents, including a PDD and validation report, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- Four corrective actions are still required, and several key fields such as monitoring period and usage monitoring method are not found in available documents.

The documentation set appears reasonably broad, with a PDD and validation report among the evidence documents and medium extraction confidence. Even so, four corrective actions remain open, and several important fields are missing from the extracted record, including the monitoring period and usage monitoring method. The recency of the crediting period is clear, but the documentation still looks incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	reversal handling not addressed
● Leakage	0% deduction but justification missing
● Baseline	project baseline stated, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible status creates claim scrutiny

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and reconcile it with the validation report's statement that leakage is not addressed.
- Close out the listed corrective actions and publish the monitoring period, ER totals, and usage monitoring method in a complete MRV package.

Documents Reviewed

- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- 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-0FA0D700 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy