

QUALITY REPORT

# Ketrawe Foundation 2018-2023

DV-0b08c9 · DOVU dMRV · Bolivia

Report ID: CM-5ADE1C2D · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>3.5</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>2.6</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.1</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>3.2</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.4</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This soil carbon project has major evidence gaps on core integrity items (baseline approach, additionality, leakage treatment, and permanence/buffer provisions) in the extracted record. While a VVB is named and no material findings/corrective actions are reported, the lack of quantified ER claims/verification figures and missing methodological details increases over-crediting and claims risk.

## Project Details

Registry	DOVU dMRV
Registry ID	DV-0b08c9
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Bolivia
Vintage	Aging
VVB	Control Union
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Baseline approach and any reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, making it hard to judge whether credited removals are conservative.
- No additionality test is found in the extracted record, and it is not confirmed by the VVB.
- Leakage deduction and justification are not stated, despite soil carbon projects often having activity-shifting and market leakage considerations.
- Permanence provisions (buffer pool percentage) and any reversal reporting are not found in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.6 / 10

- Baseline, additionality, leakage, and permanence/buffer details are not stated in the extracted record (monitoring report 2024-11 and supporting documents list).

+ The monitoring report (2024-11) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.

The extracted record does not state how the baseline was set or when it was last reassessed, which is central for soil carbon credit integrity (monitoring report 2024-11). Additionality is not described and is not confirmed by the VVB in the extracted fields (monitoring report 2024-11). Permanence risk management is unclear because no buffer pool contribution and no reversal reporting are found in the extracted record (monitoring report 2024-11). Leakage is also not quantified or justified in the extracted record (monitoring report 2024-11).

### Transparency — 4.1 / 10

+ A VVB is identified (Control Union) and a monitoring report dated 2024-11 is available in the evidence set.

- Total emission reductions/removals claimed and verified are not stated in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

A VVB is named (Control Union) and the monitoring period is long (2013-01-01 to 2023-12-31), which could support transparency if paired with clear MRV outputs (monitoring report 2024-11). However, the extracted record does not include total credits claimed or verified, preventing a basic consistency check between monitoring and verification outcomes (monitoring report 2024-11). The registry field is not found in the extracted record, limiting traceability from documents to issuance/retirement records (monitoring report 2024-11).

### Claim Safety — 3.2 / 10

+ The extracted record states the project is not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, leakage treatment, and verified vs claimed totals are not stated in the extracted record.

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of aviation-related claims being made under CORSIA (monitoring report 2024-11). CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess alignment with higher-integrity labels (monitoring report 2024-11). Because baseline method, leakage approach, and verified vs claimed totals are not stated, there is elevated greenwashing/over-crediting risk from an inability to substantiate the quantified climate benefit (monitoring report 2024-11).

### Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Three document types are referenced (monitoring report, validation report, and an additional document) with high extraction confidence.

- Key governance/safeguards elements are weak or missing (no grievance mechanism, no FPIC, and benefit sharing not described in the extracted record).

The evidence set includes a monitoring report, a validation report, and one additional document, and extraction confidence is high, suggesting the documents were readable (evidence docs list; monitoring report 2024-11). Still, several critical fields are absent from the extracted record (methodology, baseline, leakage, buffer/reversals, ER totals), indicating incomplete disclosure or incomplete extraction of key sections. Social safeguards documentation appears weak: FPIC is reported as not conducted, there is no grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing is not described (monitoring report 2024-11).

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the applied soil carbon methodology and baseline approach (including last reassessment date) and publish the quantified claimed vs verified totals for the monitoring period.

→ Provide permanence risk management details (buffer pool contribution, reversal monitoring and response procedures) and a clear leakage assessment with quantified deduction or justified negligible leakage.

→ Strengthen and document safeguards: conduct FPIC where applicable, implement a grievance mechanism, and publish benefit-sharing arrangements; resolve the safeguards reporting inconsistency across documents.

## Documents Reviewed

- CarbonSpace Ketrawe Foundation HDS1 Report 2013-2023
- Ketrawe Foundation About HDS1 Forest to add Bolivia
- CarbonSpace Verification Report 20-05-2024

### 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-5ADE1C2D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy