

## QUALITY REPORT

# Owners of the Amazon

CE-brazilian-amazon-ros · Verra · Brazil

Report ID: CM-00BBF6A8 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 5.4

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

## Assessment Summary

This Verra REDD+ avoidance project shows some strong governance signals (FPIC and a grievance mechanism) and reports no reversals with an 11.75% buffer contribution. However, key integrity-critical elements (baseline approach and leakage deduction) are not clearly stated in the extracted record, and the monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions that point to gaps in core evidence.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra
Registry ID	CE-brazilian-amazon-ros
Sector	other
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VM0015 1.1
Crediting Period	2009-01-01 — not_stated
VVB	EPIC Sustainability Services Pvt. Ltd
Verified ERs	5,720,431 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Baseline approach and timing of baseline reassessment are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual and over-crediting risk controls.
- Monitoring report lists corrective actions including missing land ownership records, missing risk assessment, and missing land-use change analysis—core evidence for a REDD project.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation report).

- Baseline method and leakage deduction are not stated in the extracted record, despite leakage being described as “quantified” (monitoring report).

The validation report indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports integrity, but the specific additionality test type is not stated in the extracted record. The monitoring report reports no reversal events and shows an 11.75% buffer contribution, which helps manage non-permanence risk. However, the baseline method and leakage deduction are not stated in the extracted record, even though leakage is described as “quantified” in the monitoring report, leaving uncertainty about whether leakage was conservatively treated.

### Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ Claimed and verified ERs match at 5,720,431 for the monitoring period 2012-01-02 to 2017-12-31 (monitoring report).

- Several MRV-critical items are missing or flagged for correction (land-use change analysis, risk assessment, sustainable development activities) (monitoring report).

The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period (2012-01-02 to 2017-12-31) and shows verified ERs equal to claimed ERs (5,720,431), which is a positive transparency signal. At the same time, the monitoring report lists multiple corrective actions (missing land ownership records, missing risk assessment, missing land-use change analysis, and missing description of sustainable development activities), which undermines confidence in the completeness of disclosed MRV evidence.

### Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ No discrepancy between claimed and verified ERs reduces immediate over-issuance risk (monitoring report).

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, and baseline/leakage quantification details are not clearly captured in the extracted record.

Because the monitoring report shows no gap between claimed and verified ERs, the immediate risk of over-issuance from verification adjustments appears low for this period. Nonetheless, the extracted record does not state the baseline method, baseline reassessment timing, or the leakage deduction percentage, which are central to over-crediting risk in REDD+ avoidance projects. CCP status and CORSIA eligibility are also not stated in available documents, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims and labeling.

### Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Three core documents are available (PDD, monitoring report, validation report) with high extraction confidence.

- Corrective actions indicate missing supporting documentation (e.g., land tenure evidence and risk assessment) (monitoring report).

The evidence set includes a PDD, monitoring report, and validation report (three documents) and the extraction confidence is high, supporting basic documentation quality. However, the monitoring report’s corrective actions explicitly cite missing foundational documents (land ownership records, risk assessment, land-use change analysis), indicating that key supporting evidence was incomplete at the time of reporting. The crediting period end date is also not clearly stated in the extracted record, reducing clarity on crediting boundaries.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	Buffer set; no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified mentioned; deduction not clear
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline approach not clearly stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach used (including parameters, data sources, and any reassessment schedule) and reconcile the crediting period dates consistently across documents.

→ Publish the leakage quantification results including the applied leakage deduction percentage, plus the missing supporting evidence flagged in corrective actions (land tenure documentation, risk assessment, and land-use change analysis).

## Documents Reviewed

- VCS Monitoring Report
- RMDLT Project Design Document
- RMDLT Verification Report - 2019

### 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-00BBF6A8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy