QUALITY REPORT

# Vaca Diez 2020-2024

DV-c0939b · DOVU dMRV

Report ID: CM-0A31318E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **2.3** Overall Score out of 10 | **Integrity (35%)** | **0.7** |
| | **Transparency (25%)** | **3.0** |
| | **Claim Safety (25%)** | **3.4** |
| | **Documentation (15%)** | **3.2** |

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

## Assessment Summary

Based on the single available monitoring report extract, core integrity elements for a REDD project (baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, and permanence/buffer provisions) are not found in the extracted record. While a VVB name is provided and no material findings or corrective actions are reported, the lack of quantified results and safeguards information materially increases over-crediting and reputational risk.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| **Registry** | DOVU dMRV |
| **Registry ID** | DV-c0939b |
| **Sector** | redd |
| **Vintage** | Recent |
| **VVB** | Control Union |
| **Monitoring Period** | 2014 — 2024 |
| **Confidence** | Medium |
| **Documents Reviewed** | 1 document reviewed |
| **Scored** | 2026-04-02 |

## Red Flags

- Baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in avoided-deforestation crediting.
- Leakage treatment is not found in the extracted record (no deduction percentage and no justification), which is a key risk area for REDD projects.
- Permanence provisions are not found in the extracted record (no buffer pool percentage and no reversal-event reporting).
- Safeguards appear weak or absent in the extracted record (no FPIC, no grievance mechanism, and no benefit-sharing description).
- No quantified emissions reduction/removal results are found in the extracted record (neither claimed nor verified totals).
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 0.7 / 10

- The monitoring report extract does not provide the baseline approach, additionality test, leakage deduction/justification, or buffer/premanence provisions needed to assess REDD credit integrity.

~ The monitoring report extract indicates no material findings and no corrective actions, but this is not sufficient to establish robustness without the missing core parameters.

For a REDD project, integrity depends heavily on a defensible baseline, additionality demonstration, leakage accounting, and permanence provisions. In the monitoring report extract (2025-04), the baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not found in the extracted record, and additionality testing/confirmation by the VVB is also not found. Leakage treatment is not found (no deduction percentage and no justification), and permanence information is not found (no buffer pool percentage and no reversal-event reporting), which together materially weaken integrity confidence.

### Transparency — 3.0 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2014-01-01 to 2024-12-31 in the monitoring report (2025-04).

- Key MRV outputs are not found in the extracted record (no claimed or verified total ERR, and no stated monitoring methods), limiting transparency.

The monitoring report (2025-04) clearly states a long monitoring period (2014-01-01—2024-12-31) and identifies the VVB as Control Union. However, the extracted record does not include claimed or verified total ERR figures, nor does it include the monitoring/measurement approach used to generate results. With only one document available, registry completeness and MRV traceability cannot be corroborated from the extracted record.

### Claim Safety — 3.4 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing one channel of double-claim/eligibility risk.

- Over-crediting risk is high because baseline, leakage, and permanence provisions are not found in the extracted record, and no verified totals are provided.

The extracted record states the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of CORSIA-related claims. Nonetheless, claim safety is undermined because the monitoring report extract does not provide the baseline approach, leakage accounting, or permanence/buffer provisions that are central to avoiding over-crediting in REDD. The absence of any claimed and verified totals in the extracted record further increases greenwashing risk because third parties cannot reconcile what was issued versus what was verified.

### Documentation — 3.2 / 10

+ A VVB name (Control Union) is provided in the extracted record, and the document date is relatively recent (2025-04).

- Only one document type is available (monitoring report), with many critical fields not found; extraction confidence is only medium.

Documentation is limited: the evidence set contains only a monitoring report (dated 2025-04) and the extraction confidence is medium, indicating potential readability/coverage limitations. While the VVB name (Control Union) is present and the extract reports no material findings and no corrective actions, the extracted record lacks many core fields typically found in a PDD and verification/validation reports (baseline, additionality, leakage, permanence, safeguards). This incompleteness constrains the ability to independently assess quality.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| ● **Additionality** | Additionality not evidenced |
| ● **Permanence** | Buffer/reversal info missing |
| ● **Leakage** | Leakage treatment not evidenced |
| ● **Baseline** | Baseline method not evidenced |
| ● **Safeguards** | Safeguards absent/unclear |
| ● **Double-claim** | Not CORSIA-eligible |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the validation/verification reports that specify the baseline methodology, additionality test and VVB conclusion, leakage deduction/justification, and permanence/buffer pool rules for the REDD crediting approach.

→ Publish quantified results and reconciliation tables (claimed vs verified ERR, issuance/retirement records) plus documented safeguards (FPIC process, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing arrangements).

## Documents Reviewed

• CarbonSpace Ecosystem carbon footprint monitoring report



Report ID: CM-0A31318E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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