

QUALITY REPORT

The Last Frontier

CE-native-alaskans-savi · ACR · Alaska

Report ID: CM-7BD81F4B · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<p>6.4</p> <p>Overall Score out of 10</p>	■ Integrity (35%)	6.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

This ACR improved forest management avoidance project shows moderate-to-good carbon accounting integrity, with additionality confirmed by the VVB and a relatively high buffer pool contribution. However, the baseline is project-specific and the timing of baseline reassessment is not stated, and there are notable inconsistencies across documents on Indigenous/safeguards-related disclosures that reduce confidence.

Project Details

Registry	American Carbon Registry (ACR)
Registry ID	CE-native-alaskans-savi
Sector	other
Country	Alaska
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 v.1.3
Crediting Period	2018 — 2038
VVB	SCS Global Services
Verified ERs	159,870 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Contradictory statements across documents on FPIC, benefit sharing, safeguards, and grievance mechanism (monitoring report 2019 vs an unknown document dated 2020-03-06).
- Baseline is project-specific and the baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents.
- Total emission reductions claimed are not stated in the extracted record, limiting cross-checking against verified issuance.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.6 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using a common-practice test (validation report).
- Baseline is project-specific and the baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents.

The validation report indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a common-practice test, which supports additionality robustness. The monitoring report (2019) applies a quantified leakage deduction of 40% and reports no reversal events, and the project contributes 18% to the buffer pool, which strengthens permanence risk management for an IFM project. Integrity is constrained by the project-specific baseline approach and the absence of a stated baseline reassessment date in the extracted record.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + VVB is identified (SCS Global Services) and a defined monitoring period is provided (monitoring report 2019).
- Claimed emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, limiting MRV cross-checking against verified results.

Transparency is moderate: the monitoring period (2018-07-27 to 2019-07-26) and the verifier (SCS Global Services) are clearly identified in the extracted record. Verified emission reductions are provided (159,870), but the claimed amount is not stated in available documents, limiting an important consistency check. Some key monitoring-related fields (such as usage monitoring) are not applicable or not stated, which is acceptable for IFM but still reduces comparability across projects.

Claim Safety — 6.8 / 10

- + Leakage is explicitly quantified with a large deduction of 40%, which reduces over-crediting risk (monitoring report 2019).
- CCP status is not stated in available documents, and safeguards-related contradictions increase greenwashing risk.

Over-crediting risk is partially mitigated by the quantified leakage treatment (40% deduction) reported in the monitoring report (2019) and by the buffer pool contribution (18%). The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces certain double-claiming/dual-channel risks, but CCP status is not stated in available documents. Contradictions on FPIC, benefit sharing, safeguards, and grievance mechanism elevate reputational and greenwashing risk even if carbon accounting is otherwise structured.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

- + Multiple document types are referenced (monitoring report and validation report) with high extraction confidence.
- One key source is listed as "unknown," and several social safeguard fields conflict across documents, reducing reliability.

Documentation coverage is fair: three documents were used (including a monitoring report and validation report), and extraction confidence is high, suggesting the underlying files were readable. However, one evidence document is labeled "unknown," and multiple key safeguard-related fields conflict between the monitoring report (2019) and an unknown document dated 2020-03-06, which undermines reliability. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, but the contradictions indicate the record is not fully coherent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed common-practice test
● Permanence	18% buffer pool; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage quantified with 40% deduction
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance/safeguards not evidenced and contradictory
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; no CCP status stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/identify the 2020-03-06 document and reconcile it with the monitoring report on FPIC, benefit sharing, safeguards, and grievance mechanism, with clear citations and dates.

→ Disclose the claimed emission reductions for the monitoring period and provide a clear baseline reassessment schedule/date to improve MRV cross-checking and baseline credibility.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report - 2019
- Project Plan - 3.6.2020
- Verification Statement

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-7BD81F4B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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