

QUALITY REPORT

Argibem, São Sebastião and Vulcão Ceramics Fuel Switching Project

VCS-63 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-F252E053 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported reversal events, but the evidence base is weakened by major documentation inconsistencies and limited public-facing MRV detail. The monitoring report also shows numerous corrective actions and weak social/safeguard documentation, which raises reliability and claim-safety concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-63
Sector	industrial
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.C. 13
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	TÜV Rheinland do Brasil Ltda
Verified ERs	31,521 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	34 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The monitoring and validation records disagree on key figures and leakage treatment, including different emissions reduction totals and different leakage characterizations.
- Safeguards are poorly documented: no FPIC, no grievance mechanism, and no clear benefit-sharing description were found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by TÜV Rheinland do Brasil Ltda, and the project uses a barrier test rather than relying on an unstated assumption.

- The monitoring report lists many corrective actions, and the record shows no buffer pool percentage or reversal-event detail, leaving permanence management only partially evidenced.

The project's additionality is stronger than average because the monitoring report says a barrier test was used and that additionality was confirmed by the VVB, TÜV Rheinland do Brasil Ltda. However, permanence is only partly supported because no buffer pool percentage is stated and no reversal-event detail is found in the extracted record. The monitoring report also lists many corrective actions, which suggests implementation and control weaknesses even though no material findings were reported.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period from 2011-07-01 to 2013-02-28, with verified and claimed reductions matching at 31,521 tCO₂e in the monitoring report.

- Usage monitoring is not stated, and the record contains multiple document inconsistencies that reduce confidence in the completeness of the public MRV trail.

The monitoring period is clearly stated and the VVB is named, which helps traceability. Still, usage monitoring is not stated in available documents, and the record does not provide a clear public MRV trail for how end-use or usage was tracked. The extracted record also shows multiple corrective actions, indicating that the reporting package needed substantial cleanup.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

+ The verified emissions reduction figure matches the claimed figure in the monitoring report, which supports internal consistency for that reporting cycle.

- The project is not CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated and the validation/monitoring records conflict on leakage treatment and reduction totals, increasing over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the contradiction between the monitoring report and validation report on emissions reductions and leakage treatment. I privileged the monitoring report for the 31,521 tCO₂e figure because it is the later reporting document and matches the verified amount in the same cycle, but the earlier validation record reportedly used 41,597 and described leakage as deemed negligible, while the monitoring report says leakage was quantified. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but CCP status is not stated and the conflicting records raise over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ The record draws on multiple official documents, including monitoring, validation, and issuance materials, and extraction confidence is high.

- Several key fields are not stated in available documents, including buffer pool, usage monitoring method, and baseline reassessment timing, and the monitoring report contains numerous CARs.

Documentation is moderate rather than strong: there are multiple official documents in the record and extraction confidence is high, but several core items are missing or not stated, including buffer pool coverage, usage monitoring method, and baseline reassessment timing. The monitoring report also contains a long list of CARs, including corrections to project naming, tables, and monitoring sections, which suggests the documentation package was not fully polished. Because the record is incomplete on several key quality indicators, documentation cannot score higher.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test, but contradictory prior record
● Permanence	No reversal events reported, but buffer pool not stated
● Leakage	Leakage addressed, but treatment conflicts across documents
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, but reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	No FPIC or grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish a reconciled emissions and leakage memo that explains why the monitoring report and validation report differ, and clearly states which figures govern issuance.
- Add complete MRV and safeguard documentation, including usage monitoring procedures, buffer pool or reversal provisions, grievance handling, and any benefit-sharing or FPIC evidence.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification 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-F252E053 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy