

QUALITY REPORT

North Pikounda REDD+

VCS-1052 · VCS · Congo, The Democratic Republic of the

Report ID: CM-3BAE61DE · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
■ Transparency (25%)	6.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
■ Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows moderate-to-good carbon accounting integrity signals for a REDD+ activity, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a stated buffer contribution (23%), and no reported reversals in the latest monitoring record. However, key elements are weakened by contradictions across documents (notably FPIC and leakage treatment) and by a project-specific baseline with no clear reassessment date. Overall, the credit quality appears mid-range with notable social safeguards and consistency risks.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1052
Sector	redd
Country	Congo, The Democratic Republic of the
Vintage	2012
Project Methodology	VM0011 1.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2041
VVB	KBS Certification Services
Verified ERs	69,547 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Contradictory statements on whether FPIC was conducted (2013 monitoring report says yes; 2024 monitoring report says no).
- Leakage is described as quantified but the deduction is 0%, and earlier validation documentation did not address leakage—raising over-crediting and consistency concerns.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (KBS Certification Services) and no material findings/corrective actions are reported in the latest monitoring record (2024 monitoring report).

- Baseline is project-specific and the baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record; leakage treatment shows inconsistencies across documents (validation vs later monitoring).

The latest monitoring report (2024-07-31) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings or corrective actions, which supports robustness of the MRV process. Permanence risk management appears present via a 23% buffer contribution and no reported reversal events in the latest monitoring record. However, the baseline is described as project-specific and the baseline reassessment date is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline validity over a long crediting period (2012–2041). Leakage is described as quantified with a 0% deduction, but earlier documentation did not address leakage, creating uncertainty about whether leakage was fully and consistently treated.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated (2013-01-01 to 2021-10-31) and the VVB is named (KBS Certification Services) in the extracted record.

- Total ERs claimed are not found in the extracted record, limiting cross-checking against the verified ER figure (2024 monitoring report).

The extracted record provides clear identifiers (VCS registry, VCS-1052) and names the VVB (KBS Certification Services), and it specifies a long monitoring period (2013-01-01 to 2021-10-31) in the 2024 monitoring report. The verified ER figure is provided (69,547), but the total ERs claimed are not found in the extracted record, reducing the ability to reconcile claims versus verification outcomes. CORSIA eligibility is also not stated in the extracted record, limiting clarity for downstream buyers. Overall transparency is decent but constrained by missing key reconciliation fields.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ A 23% buffer contribution and no reported reversals in the latest monitoring record reduce permanence-related over-crediting risk (2024 monitoring report).

- CORSIA eligibility is not stated in the extracted record and there are contradictions on safeguards/leakage, increasing greenwashing and reliability risk.

Claim safety is moderated by permanence controls (23% buffer) and the latest monitoring report's statement of no reversals, which reduces the risk of invalid credits from reversals. However, the project uses a project-specific baseline with no reassessment timing stated in the extracted record, which can elevate over-crediting risk if conditions change over time. Leakage is said to be quantified yet results in a 0% deduction, and earlier validation documentation did not address leakage, which increases the risk that buyers could face challenges to the credibility of net emission reductions. CORSIA eligibility is not stated and CCP status is not mentioned, leaving uncertainty about how claims should be framed in higher-integrity channels.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is indicated (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 18 documents used.

- One evidence document is listed as "unknown" and contradictions across documents suggest some recordkeeping/consistency weaknesses.

The extracted record indicates a substantial documentation base (18 documents used) including a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance, and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting document reliability. The latest monitoring report is recent (2024-07-31), which helps recency. Still, at least one evidence document is labeled "unknown," and multiple contradictions across documents suggest inconsistencies that reduce confidence in specific assertions (notably safeguards and leakage). On balance, documentation quality is above average but not fully clean.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Buffer in place; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Quantified but 0% deduction; inconsistent record
● Baseline	Project-specific; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards noted but FPIC contradictory
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear, consistent safeguards narrative with dated evidence (FPIC process documentation, participant lists, meeting minutes, and grievance logs) to resolve the FPIC contradiction across monitoring reports.

→ Provide a transparent leakage section that reconciles why leakage is quantified yet results in a 0% deduction, including activity-shifting/market leakage assumptions and any sensitivity analysis, and ensure consistency between validation and monitoring/verification documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Non-permanence risk report
- AFOLU Project Element
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification 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-3BAE61DE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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