

QUALITY REPORT

Toucan Base Carbon Tonne

CC-6 · Verra VCS

Report ID: CM-34097417 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.5
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high due to lack of evidence rather than confirmed deficiencies.

Project Details

Registry	Verra VCS
Registry ID	CC-6
Sector	soil_carbon
Vintage	2023
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any reversals/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record

~ Soil carbon projects typically face permanence and measurement uncertainty, but no project-specific controls were documented

No validation/verification, monitoring, or methodology details were found in the extracted record (no evidence documents captured). As a result, additionality testing, baseline selection and reassessment timing, leakage deductions/justification, and any permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool) cannot be confirmed. Given the sector is soil carbon, the absence of documented permanence and MRV controls is a material integrity concern by default.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or error reconciliation information was found in the extracted record

- Registry completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured

The extracted record contains no VVB name, monitoring period, or reported-versus-verified emissions reduction figures because no documents were available. With low extraction confidence, even if documents exist elsewhere, the current record does not support transparent third-party scrutiny. This results in very low transparency scoring based on evidence gaps.

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- No evidence was found on baseline setting, leakage justification, or quantified uncertainty—raising over-crediting/greenwashing risk by default

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, so double-claim channel risk cannot be screened

No information was found on baseline method, leakage treatment, uncertainty/error, or any eligibility statuses that would help bound over-crediting and reputational risk. For soil carbon, claim safety depends heavily on conservative quantification and permanence safeguards, none of which are evidenced here. Therefore, claims should be treated as high-risk until supported by primary documents.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, leaving the assessment unsupported by primary sources

- Low extraction confidence suggests missing/illegible source material

The extracted record shows zero documents used and low extraction confidence, indicating missing and/or unreadable source material. Without PDD/monitoring/verification reports in the evidence set, the project cannot be assessed against VCS requirements in a defensible way. This drives the documentation score near the floor.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Permanence controls not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the PDD and the most recent verification/monitoring reports (including VVB name, monitoring period, and reported vs verified ERs) so baseline, additionality, and MRV can be assessed
- Provide documented permanence and leakage provisions (e.g., buffer contribution, reversal procedures, leakage assessment and any deduction) and safeguards evidence (FPIC/grievance mechanism)

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-34097417 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy