QUALITY REPORT

For the Birds

CAR-683 · CAR

Report ID: CM-DF939024 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.7 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.6
Transparency (25%)	6.2
Claim Safety (25%)	6.8
Documentation (15%)	7.3

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

Assessment Summary

This CAR IFM project shows moderate-to-good carbon accounting integrity, with VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction (20%), and a substantial buffer contribution (20.9%) with no reversals reported. However, the baseline is project-specific and the timing of baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, and several cross-document inconsistencies reduce confidence in how consistently key topics were treated over time.

Project Details

Registry	Climate Action Reserve (CAR)
Registry ID	CAR-683
Sector	redd
Vintage	Stale
Crediting Period	2007 — 2107
VVB	S&A; Carbon, LLC
Verified ERs	11,427 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Baseline is project-specific and the timing of baseline reassessment was not found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk.
- ■ Safeguards and leakage treatment are inconsistently described across documents (PDD vs later validation/monitoring), indicating documentation reliability gaps.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.6 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a common-practice test, and the monitoring report reports no reversals with a 20.9% buffer contribution.

- The baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing was not found in the extracted record; earlier project documentation also did not address some integrity topics later covered.

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a common-practice test (validation report). Leakage is treated quantitatively with a 20% deduction and described as quantified (validation report/monitoring record), and permanence risk is partly managed via a 20.9% buffer pool contribution with no reversals reported for the period (monitoring report, 2021-12-22). Integrity is constrained by the use of a project-specific baseline and the absence of a stated baseline reassessment date in the extracted record.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated (2020-09-01 to 2021-08-31) and the VVB is identified as S&A; Carbon, LLC, with no material findings or corrective actions reported.

- Total emissions reductions/removals claimed were not found in the extracted record (only verified ERR of 11,427 is available), limiting independent reconciliation.

The monitoring report (2021-12-22) clearly specifies the monitoring period (2020-09-01—2021-08-31) and reports verified ERR of 11,427, and the VVB is named (S&A; Carbon, LLC). The monitoring/verification record shows no material findings and no corrective actions required. Transparency is reduced because total ERR claimed was not found in the extracted record, preventing a claimed-versus-verified cross-check.

Claim Safety — 6.8 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain double-claiming/dual-channel risks.

- Project-specific baselines and inconsistent treatment of leakage/safeguards across documents elevate perceived over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Over-crediting risk is moderated by quantified leakage (20%) and a substantial buffer contribution (20.9%) reported in the monitoring record, alongside no reversals reported. The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers certain double-claiming concerns. Claim safety remains only moderate because the baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing was not found in the extracted record, and because some key topics (leakage and safeguards) appear inconsistently addressed across older vs newer documents.

Documentation — 7.3 / 10

+ Multiple official document types are present (PDD, monitoring report, validation report) with high extraction confidence and no corrective actions required.

- Key fields are missing or not found in the extracted record (e.g., baseline reassessment timing, total ERR claimed), and contradictions across documents reduce reliability.

The extracted record includes a PDD, monitoring report, and validation report, and extraction confidence is high, supporting a solid documentation score. The monitoring report (2021-12-22) provides recent MRV-period detail, and the validation report (2022-02-02) provides third-party assessment context. Documentation quality is weakened by missing key quantitative fields (e.g., total ERR claimed) and by contradictions across documents on safeguards, reversals discussion, and leakage discussion.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed common-practice additionality
● **Permanence**	Buffer pool (20.9%) and no reversals reported
● **Leakage**	Quantified leakage with 20% deduction
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards inconsistently documented; no FPIC/grievance found
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose baseline reassessment timing and provide a clear, document-linked rationale for baseline updates over time to reduce over-crediting concerns.

→ Provide consistent, auditable safeguards documentation (FPIC where applicable, benefit-sharing, and a grievance mechanism) and ensure alignment across PDD, validation, and monitoring reports.

Documents Reviewed

- 2021 Monitoring Report
- Forest Project Design Document
- Verification Report, 2018
- Verification Report, 2015
- 2021 Verification Report
- 2021 Verification Statement

Report ID: CM-DF939024 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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