

## QUALITY REPORT

# Vista Alegre

VCS-1 · Gold Standard · Peru

Report ID: CM-84BAB9F5 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>5.0</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the extracted record, which supports basic credibility. However, leakage is not addressed, safeguards are absent, and key quantification fields (verified ERs, leakage deduction, baseline reassessment) are missing, increasing over-crediting and reputational risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	VCS-1
Sector	other
Country	Peru
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	AMS I.D 10
Crediting Period	2007 — 2014
VVB	SGS United Kingdom Ltd
Monitoring Period	2006 — 2007
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no justification and no deduction stated).
- Safeguards are not evidenced: no FPIC, no grievance mechanism, and safeguards not mentioned.
- Key MRV outputs are missing from the extracted record (no claimed or verified emission reductions).
- Contradictory additionality test type between the PDD and the validation report.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation report (2007-09-26) confirms additionality.

- Leakage treatment is missing/absent in the extracted record (monitoring report dated 2008-02-25).

Additionality is supported because the validation report (2007-09-26) confirms additionality, and the extracted record shows no material findings or corrective actions. Baseline setting appears project-specific (baseline described as project-based), and there is no evidence in the extracted record of a baseline reassessment date. Leakage is a major integrity gap: the monitoring report (2008-02-25) does not address leakage and no leakage deduction is stated.

### Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ A named VVB is provided (SGS United Kingdom Ltd) and core project dates are available (monitoring report dated 2008-02-25).

- The extracted record does not include claimed or verified emission reductions for the monitoring period.

The project has basic transparency elements such as an identified VVB (SGS United Kingdom Ltd) and a clearly stated monitoring period (2006-04-01 to 2007-10-20) in the monitoring report (2008-02-25). However, the extracted record does not provide either claimed or verified emission reductions for that period, limiting the ability to independently evaluate performance. Usage monitoring methods are also not stated in available documents, reducing MRV clarity.

### Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

- Leakage is not addressed, increasing over-crediting risk for claims.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, limiting confidence for downstream claims screening.

Because leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, there is elevated risk that credited reductions could be overstated, which weakens the safety of public claims. The project is labeled as a contribution credit type, but neither CORSIA eligibility nor CCP status is stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily screen for eligibility-related claim constraints. The baseline is project-specific and the timing of any reassessment is not found in the extracted record, adding uncertainty around over-crediting risk.

### Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ Multiple key documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- Safeguards and usage monitoring details are not evidenced in the extracted record.

Documentation coverage is moderate: the extracted record includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report (three documents) with high extraction confidence. The monitoring report is dated 2008-02-25 and covers an early monitoring period, but key quantitative outputs (claimed/verified ERs) are not present in the extracted record. Safeguards-related documentation is notably absent (no FPIC, no grievance mechanism, and safeguards not mentioned).

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	Reversal/buffer not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment not evidenced
● <b>Safeguards</b>	No FPIC/grievance/safeguards evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the monitoring/verification results for the stated monitoring period, including claimed and verified emission reductions and any uncertainty/QA-QC notes.

→ Provide an explicit leakage assessment (and deduction if applicable) consistent with the applied methodology, with clear justification in the monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Publish safeguards evidence (FPIC process, stakeholder consultation outcomes, and a functioning grievance mechanism) and describe benefit-sharing arrangements if relevant.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation

### 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-84BAB9F5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy