

QUALITY REPORT

Foz Do Chapecó Project

VCS-896 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-A1BD5923 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has a VVB-confirmed investment additionality case and a long monitoring period with matched claimed vs verified reductions in the extracted record. However, multiple document inconsistencies (especially around total ERs and crediting period) and extensive corrective actions related to metering, grid factors, and spreadsheets increase over-crediting and reliability risk. Leakage treatment is weakly evidenced in the more recent monitoring record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-896
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2011, 2012
Project Methodology	ACM0002 13.0.0
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	12,450,836 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large contradiction in total emission reductions between two validation reports (about 1.29 million vs 12.45 million), raising reliability/over-crediting concerns
- Monitoring/verification raised numerous corrective actions on metering evidence, calibration certificates, and grid emission factor calculations (combined margin/OM/BM inconsistencies)

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation report).
- Leakage is not addressed in the more recent monitoring record and no leakage deduction is evidenced in the extracted record (monitoring report 2021).

The validation documentation indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (validation report). Baseline setting is project-specific under ACM0002, and while a reassessment year is indicated as 2022, the extracted record does not provide grid EF inputs (e.g., grid EF year/value), which limits independent checking (validation/monitoring records). Leakage is a key weakness: the 2021 monitoring report indicates leakage was not addressed and no leakage deduction is evidenced, which is conservative-negative for integrity. No material findings are listed, but the monitoring report includes numerous corrective actions that point to underlying MRV weaknesses affecting integrity (monitoring report 2021).

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

- + VVB is identified (Earthood Services) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (monitoring report 2021).
- Data quality issues are evidenced by multiple corrective actions on generation data, meter periods, and emission factor spreadsheets (monitoring report 2021).

The project identifies the VVB (Earthood Services Private Limited) and provides a clear monitoring period (2012-07-01 to 2020-10-14) and crediting period information in the monitoring record (monitoring report 2021). Claimed and verified ERs match in the extracted record, which is a positive transparency signal, but this is undermined by contradictions across validation reports on the ER total. The monitoring report's corrective actions highlight transparency/MRV gaps, including inconsistencies with CCEE meter readings, unclear meter operational periods, and discrepancies in combined margin calculations and supporting spreadsheets (monitoring report 2021).

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

- + The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim/double-claim exposure (registry extract).
- Contradictory ER totals across validation reports and unresolved leakage treatment increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk (validation reports 2012 vs 2022; monitoring reports 2012 vs 2021).

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation claims and some double-claim exposure (registry extract). However, over-crediting risk is elevated by major inconsistencies in reported total ERs between validation reports and by MRV corrective actions related to generation data and grid emission factor calculations (validation reports 2012 vs 2022; monitoring report 2021). Leakage treatment is also inconsistent across monitoring reports (deemed negligible vs not addressed), which increases uncertainty around whether all relevant sources were conservatively handled (monitoring reports 2012 vs 2021). CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving an additional claim-channel uncertainty.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 17 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- The record contains major cross-document inconsistencies (ER totals, crediting period, safeguards/FPIC/grievance), reducing confidence in the documentation set.

The extracted record references a reasonably complete set of document types (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and indicates 17 documents were used with high extraction confidence. Despite this, the documentation set contains multiple contradictions on core attributes (ER totals, crediting period, and safeguards/FPIC/grievance), which reduces confidence that the narrative is consistent across official documents. The presence of many corrective actions (including requests for calibration accreditation evidence and official CCEE reports) suggests that key evidentiary items were missing or unclear at least at the time of review (monitoring report 2021).

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent/unclear
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; inputs not fully evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistently reported
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note across versions explaining the ER total difference (2012 vs 2022 validation reports) and how it maps to specific monitoring/crediting periods and issuances.

→ Strengthen MRV transparency by providing complete CCEE official reports, meter calibration/accreditation evidence, and a consistent, auditable grid emission factor calculation package (OM/BM/CM) for all years.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- 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-A1BD5923 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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