QUALITY REPORT

Chestnut Mountain

CE-chestnut-mountain-tn · ACR · Tennessee

Report ID: CM-582A8B11 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	4.6
Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
Documentation (15%)	5.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project appears to follow an ACR improved forest management approach with an 18% buffer contribution and no reversals reported for the 2018–2019 monitoring period. However, key quantification elements (baseline approach, leakage deduction value, and verified ER totals) were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in crediting accuracy and public traceability.

Project Details

Registry	American Carbon Registry (ACR)
Registry ID	CE-chestnut-mountain-tn
Sector	water
Country	Tennessee
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Improved Forest Management Methodology for Quantifying GHG Removals and Emission Reductions through Increased Forest Carbon Sequestration on Non-Federal U.S. Forestlands 1.3
Crediting Period	2018 — 2038
VVB	Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Baseline approach and timing of any baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record, making it hard to judge over-crediting risk.
- ■ Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage was not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Neither claimed nor verified total emission reductions/removals for the monitoring period were found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2019) states no intentional or unintentional reversals during the reporting period and shows an 18% buffer contribution.

- The baseline method and leakage deduction value were not found in the extracted record, weakening confidence in the ER quantification.

The monitoring report (2019) indicates an 18% buffer pool contribution and reports no intentional or unintentional reversals during the 2018–2019 reporting period, which supports permanence management. Additionality is indicated as confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, but the specific additionality test type was not found, limiting how robustly it can be evaluated. The baseline approach and the leakage deduction percentage were not found in the extracted record, even though leakage is described as quantified, which reduces confidence in the integrity of the credited ERs.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period (2018-12-06 to 2019-12-05) and VVB name are clearly stated in the monitoring report (2019).

- Key MRV outputs (claimed and verified ER totals) and the monitoring/usage measurement approach were not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2019) clearly states the monitoring period (2018-12-06 to 2019-12-05) and identifies the verifier (Aster Global Environmental Solutions, Inc). However, the extracted record does not include total claimed or total verified ERs for the period, preventing a basic reconciliation of what was monitored versus what was issued. The method for monitoring activity/usage was also not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing some downstream double-claiming/eligibility confusion.

- Over-crediting risk cannot be well screened because the baseline method and quantified leakage deduction value were not found in the extracted record.

The extracted record states the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of certain high-profile eligibility-based claims. At the same time, the baseline method is not stated in the extracted record and the leakage deduction value is missing despite being described as quantified, both of which elevate over-crediting and greenwashing risk because outsiders cannot validate the core accounting choices. CCP status was not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about how the credits may be marketed against integrity labels.

Documentation — 5.8 / 10

+ Extraction confidence is high and the monitoring report (2019) includes the monitoring period and reversal statement.

- Only two documents (monitoring report and appendix) were available in the extracted record, and several core quantification fields are missing.

Documentation quality is moderate: the extracted record includes a monitoring report dated 2019 plus an appendix, and extraction confidence is high. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is a positive signal for audit outcomes. Still, with only two documents captured and multiple missing core fields (baseline method, ER totals, leakage deduction value), the documentation set appears incomplete for independent assessment.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality (test type not specified)
● **Permanence**	18% buffer and no reversals reported for the period
● **Leakage**	Leakage said to be quantified, but deduction value missing
● **Baseline**	Baseline approach not found in extracted record
● **Safeguards**	No FPIC, grievance mechanism, or safeguards documentation found
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible (CCP status not stated)

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach (including any reassessment schedule) and provide the specific baseline parameters used for the 2018–2019 quantification.

→ Publish a clear ER reconciliation for the monitoring period (claimed vs verified totals) and the quantified leakage deduction percentage with calculation references.

Documents Reviewed

- Chestnut Mountain Monitoring Report 2019
- Chestnut Mountain ACR Monitoring Report 2019

Report ID: CM-582A8B11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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