

QUALITY REPORT

Engenheiro Ernesto Jorge Dreher And Engenheiro Henrique Kotzian Shps VCS Project (Jun1120)

VCS-708 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-CF780449 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS small hydropower project has VVB-confirmed additionality and uses an established grid-connected renewable methodology (ACM0002), but key MRV elements show reliability weaknesses. Multiple corrective actions and several cross-document inconsistencies (including verified ER figures and crediting period) increase over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-708
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2012, 2016
Project Methodology	ACM0002 12.1.0
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	56,202 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2011 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	29 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Conflicting verified emission reduction totals within the same dated validation record (56,202 vs 196,522), indicating a serious data reliability issue.
- Monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions, including discrepancies in net energy generation figures cross-checked against CCEE and calculation errors in spreadsheets.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports (previously deemed negligible vs later not addressed), weakening baseline/leakage credibility.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation report confirms additionality and applies ACM0002 for grid-connected renewable electricity.
- Leakage is inconsistently treated across monitoring reports and several corrective actions relate to core monitoring parameters and generation data quality.

The validation report confirms additionality via an investment test and the project applies ACM0002, which supports a credible grid-displacement accounting approach. However, leakage is not consistently handled: an older monitoring report deems leakage negligible, while a later monitoring report does not address leakage at all. The 2021 monitoring report also lists multiple corrective actions tied to monitoring plan completeness, spreadsheet calculation errors, and mismatches in net energy generation figures cross-checked against CCEE, which undermines confidence in quantified ERs.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

- + Key project identifiers, VVB name (Earthood), monitoring period (2011–2012), and ER totals are present in the extracted record.
- Contradictory ER figures and multiple corrective actions reduce confidence that reported numbers are consistently traceable and reproducible.

The extracted record includes the monitoring period (2011–2012), the VVB (Earthood Services Private Limited), and ER totals, suggesting some core disclosure is available. Transparency is weakened by contradictions in key headline numbers (verified ER totals) and by the monitoring report's corrective actions indicating that not all required parameters were presented and that some parameters reported were not part of the registered monitoring plan. These issues make it harder for third parties to independently reproduce results from the documentation set.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

- + The claimed and verified ER totals match at 56,202 in the extracted record for the monitoring period.
- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, and contradictions in ER totals and crediting period elevate over-crediting/claims risk.

Over-crediting risk is elevated by inconsistencies in the ER figures and by MRV issues flagged as corrective actions in the monitoring report (including generation data discrepancies and calculation errors). CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks. Leakage treatment inconsistency (negligible vs not addressed across monitoring reports) further increases uncertainty around net climate benefit claims.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

- + A relatively large document set was used (20) with high extraction confidence and named VVB.
- Several internal inconsistencies across official documents (and within the same dated validation record) indicate documentation control/versioning problems.

Documentation coverage is moderate: multiple document types are present (monitoring report, validation report, PDD) and the extraction confidence is high, which supports usability. Nonetheless, the monitoring report includes several corrective actions that point to incomplete or inconsistent presentation of monitoring parameters and spreadsheet errors, indicating documentation quality control issues. Contradictions across documents (and within the same dated validation record) also reduce confidence that the document set is internally consistent and well-versioned.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent/unclear
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/grievance inconsistently documented; no FPIC
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish a reconciled ER accounting package that resolves the conflicting verified ER totals (56,202 vs 196,522) and clearly ties generation data to CCEE sources and corrected spreadsheets.
- Provide a consistent leakage assessment under ACM0002 (explicitly negligible with justification or quantified deduction) and clearly document safeguards, FPIC approach, and grievance mechanism in a stable, version-controlled set of documents.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- 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-CF780449 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy