

QUALITY REPORT

# Doyon Native Community Forest Project

ACR-592 · ACR · United States

Report ID: CM-160AF2D2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>6.5</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

## Assessment Summary

This ACR IFM project shows several integrity-positive features, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a substantial 22% buffer contribution, and a large quantified leakage deduction of 40%. However, key baseline and crediting details were not found in the extracted record, and safeguards reporting is inconsistent between the PDD and the monitoring report, which increases uncertainty for buyers.

## Project Details

Registry	American Carbon Registry (ACR)
Registry ID	ACR-592
Sector	redd
Country	United States
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	Improved Forest Management (IFM) on Non-Federal U.S. Forestlands 1.3
VVB	SCS Global Services
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Baseline approach and timing of baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in over-crediting risk controls.
- Safeguards disclosure is inconsistent: the monitoring report mentions safeguards, while the PDD indicates they are not mentioned.
- No verified or claimed ERR totals were found in the extracted record, reducing the ability to cross-check issuance claims.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation report), and no material findings or corrective actions were reported (monitoring report, 2022-09-23).

- Baseline method and baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty around baseline validity.

The validation documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. Permanence risk management appears reasonably strong for an IFM project due to a 22% buffer pool contribution (extracted record), and no reversals were reported in the extracted record. Leakage treatment is comparatively conservative: the monitoring documentation indicates leakage was quantified with a 40% leakage deduction (monitoring report, 2022-09-23). The main integrity gap is that the baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, which is central to IFM credit quantification.

### Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ Independent VVB is identified as SCS Global Services, and a specific monitoring period is disclosed (monitoring report, 2022-09-23).

- Total ERR claimed and total ERR verified were not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV cross-checking.

The monitoring report clearly states the monitoring period (2020-08-19 to 2021-08-18) and identifies the verifier as SCS Global Services (monitoring report, 2022-09-23). The extracted record also shows no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is helpful for assessing audit outcomes (monitoring report, 2022-09-23). However, total ERR claimed and total ERR verified were not found in the extracted record, preventing a basic reconciliation of quantified outcomes. Several operational MRV details (for example, usage monitoring) are not applicable or not found, which limits transparency beyond core forest carbon accounting.

### Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (extracted record).

- Baseline details were not found in the extracted record, and CCP status is not stated, leaving residual over-crediting and label-claim uncertainty.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-profile aviation-related claims (extracted record). Leakage appears to be treated conservatively via a large quantified deduction of 40% (monitoring report, 2022-09-23), which can reduce over-crediting risk if appropriately justified. Nonetheless, baseline method details were not found in the extracted record, which is a primary driver of over-crediting risk in IFM. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, so buyers should avoid making CCP-aligned claims without further confirmation.

## Documentation — 7.4 / 10

- + Three core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.
- Safeguards reporting differs between the PDD (2022-09-15) and monitoring report (2022-09-23), indicating internal documentation inconsistency.

The extracted record includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report (three documents total) with high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation score. The monitoring report is recent (2022-09-23) and includes the monitoring period and audit outcomes (monitoring report, 2022-09-23). However, some key quantification fields (ERR totals, baseline method, crediting period) were not found in the extracted record, indicating incompleteness for buyer due diligence. In addition, safeguards reporting is inconsistent between documents, which reduces confidence in narrative disclosures.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	Buffer pool contribution; no reversals found
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified leakage with 40% deduction
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not found in extracted record
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards inconsistently documented; no FPIC/grievance
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

- Disclose and/or extract the baseline approach used and the date/results of the most recent baseline reassessment, with clear references to the governing ACR IFM methodology sections.
- Provide the monitoring/verification tables showing total ERR claimed and total ERR verified for the stated monitoring period, enabling reconciliation against registry issuance/retirement records.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification 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-160AF2D2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)