

QUALITY REPORT

# Where Trees Save the Seas

CE-where-trees-save-the · Verra · Guatemala

Report ID: CM-56008C71 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

## Assessment Summary

The extracted record indicates a REDD+ avoidance project with strong social process signals (FPIC and a grievance mechanism) and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the available monitoring documentation. However, key carbon-accounting elements (baseline approach, leakage deduction value, buffer/pooling for reversals, and verified ERs) are not stated in the extracted record, which increases uncertainty and over-crediting risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra
Registry ID	CE-where-trees-save-the
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Guatemala
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VM0015 1.1
Crediting Period	2012 — 2042
VVB	S&A; Carbon, LLC
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in additionality and credit quantification.
- Leakage is described as “quantified” but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not stated in the extracted record.
- No buffer pool contribution percentage or reversal-risk treatment is stated in the extracted record for a long crediting period (2012–2042).
- Verified and claimed emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record for the 2017–2018 monitoring period.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The monitoring documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Core accounting parameters (baseline method, leakage deduction value, buffer pool contribution, and reversals) are not stated in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2019) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and it reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. However, the extracted record does not state the baseline method, the last baseline reassessment date, the leakage deduction percentage (despite saying leakage was quantified), or any buffer pool contribution for non-permanence. With a long crediting period (2012–2042), these missing accounting details materially weaken confidence in the robustness of credited reductions.

### Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ The extracted record identifies the VVB (S&A; Carbon, LLC) and specifies the monitoring period (2017–2018).

- Claimed vs. verified ER totals are not stated in the extracted record, reducing MRV transparency.

The extracted record provides basic MRV identifiers, including the VVB name (S&A; Carbon, LLC) and a defined monitoring period (2017-01-01 to 2018-12-31) from the monitoring report (2019). But the extracted record does not include total emission reductions claimed or verified for that period, preventing a clear check of issuance-relevant quantities. Public-facing completeness is therefore moderate: some governance details are present, but key quantitative MRV outputs are missing.

### Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ Social safeguards signals are relatively strong (FPIC, benefit sharing described, grievance mechanism).

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and missing baseline/leakage figures elevate over-crediting and claims risk.

The project shows relatively stronger safeguards process indicators in the extracted record: FPIC is marked as conducted, benefit sharing is described, and a grievance mechanism is present (from the available documents). Nonetheless, over-crediting risk cannot be well bounded because the baseline approach and leakage deduction value are not stated in the extracted record, even though leakage is described as quantified. In addition, CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims and labeling.

### Documentation — 6.2 / 10

+ High extraction confidence and no reported corrective actions/material findings in the available monitoring documentation.

- Only two documents were available (PDD and monitoring report), leaving major quantification fields not found in the extracted record.

Only two documents are listed as evidence (PDD and a monitoring report dated 2019-07-19), but extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report (2019) shows no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports document quality and audit outcomes. Still, multiple critical fields (baseline method, buffer pool percentage, leakage deduction percentage, ER totals) are not found in the extracted record, indicating incomplete documentation coverage for scoring purposes.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality (test type not specified)
● <b>Permanence</b>	Non-permanence treatment not evidenced (buffer/reversals not stated)
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage said to be quantified, but deduction value not stated
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline approach not stated in extracted record
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the baseline approach and the date of the most recent baseline reassessment from the PDD/verification documentation, including key parameters used to quantify ERs.

→ Disclose the quantified leakage deduction percentage and the verified vs. claimed ER totals for the 2017–2018 monitoring period, along with evidence of non-permanence risk management (buffer pool contribution and any reversal reporting).

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report 2017-2018
- PDD 2017-2019

### 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-56008C71 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)