QUALITY REPORT

Vaca Diez 2014-2019

DV-e048fe · DOVU dMRV

Report ID: CM-C7F16168 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.6 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	1.1
	Transparency (25%)	3.4
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.2
	Documentation (15%)	3.8

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the single available monitoring report extract, key 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 evidence base is too thin to support high confidence in credit quality.

Project Details

Registry	DOVU dMRV
Registry ID	DV-e048fe
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 approach and any baseline reassessment timing are not found in the extracted record for a REDD project.
- ■ No leakage deduction or leakage justification is found in the extracted record, despite leakage being a common material risk in REDD.
- ■ No permanence risk management details (e.g., buffer pool contribution or reversal reporting) are found in the extracted record.
- ■ Additionality test type and whether the VVB confirmed additionality are not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- ■ Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.1 / 10

- Baseline method, leakage treatment, and permanence/buffer provisions are not found in the extracted record (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

~ No material findings or corrective actions are reported, but this is hard to interpret without the underlying verification detail (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

For a REDD project, integrity hinges on a defensible baseline, leakage treatment, and permanence risk management, but the extracted record does not include a baseline method, any baseline reassessment date, a leakage deduction or justification, or any buffer pool contribution (monitoring report extract, 2025-04). Additionality is also not evidenced in the extracted record: neither the additionality test type nor confirmation by the VVB is found (monitoring report extract, 2025-04). No material findings or corrective actions are reported, but without the missing core design and accounting elements, this does not materially increase confidence (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

Transparency — 3.4 / 10

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

- Core MRV outputs (claimed vs verified emission reductions) and monitoring methods are not found in the extracted record (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

The monitoring period is clearly provided as 2014-01-01 through 2024-12-31, which supports basic transparency on the time boundary (monitoring report extract, 2025-04). However, the extracted record does not include claimed or verified emission reductions, nor does it describe monitoring methods (e.g., how activity data and forest cover change were monitored), limiting the ability to scrutinize MRV quality (monitoring report extract, 2025-04). Registry details are also not found in the extracted record (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

Claim Safety — 3.2 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing one channel of eligibility-related claim risk (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

- Over-crediting risk cannot be assessed because baseline, leakage, and verified results are not found in the extracted record (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of CORSIA-related marketing claims (monitoring report extract, 2025-04). CCP status is not found in the extracted record, and the absence of baseline, leakage, and verified results makes over-crediting risk difficult to evaluate (monitoring report extract, 2025-04). With safeguards indicators negative (no FPIC, no grievance mechanism, and safeguards not mentioned), reputational and stakeholder-claim risks are elevated (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

Documentation — 3.8 / 10

+ A VVB is identified (Control Union) and the document is recent (dated 2025-04) (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

- Only one document type is available and extraction confidence is not high, leaving major evidence gaps (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

Documentation is limited to a single monitoring report extract, with medium extraction confidence, which leaves substantial evidence gaps for a REDD assessment (monitoring report extract, 2025-04). The VVB is identified as Control Union and the document date is recent (2025-04), which is a positive signal for recency and third-party involvement (monitoring report extract, 2025-04). However, without the PDD/methodology and verification outputs, the documentation set is not sufficient to substantiate key quality claims (monitoring report extract, 2025-04).

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	No additionality evidence found
● **Permanence**	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
● **Leakage**	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● **Baseline**	Baseline method not evidenced
● **Safeguards**	FPIC/grievance not in record
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD/methodology and baseline documentation, including baseline setting approach and the most recent baseline reassessment date.

→ Provide verification outputs with claimed vs verified emission reductions and a clear leakage assessment (quantified deduction or justified negligible leakage), plus permanence risk management (buffer pool contribution and any reversal reporting).

Documents Reviewed

• CarbonSpace Ecosystem carbon footprint monitoring report

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-C7F16168 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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