QUALITY REPORT

Bethlehem Authority Improved Forest Management Project

VCS-1060 · VCS · United States

Report ID: CM-0F50D1B8 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.8
	Transparency (25%)	5.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS forest project with a VVB-confirmed additionality assessment, a quantified leakage deduction, and no reported reversals in the latest monitoring record. However, the record shows multiple contradictions across documents, a long crediting period with no reassessment date found, and weak social safeguard evidence in the latest monitoring report, which limits confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1060
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	United States
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VM0003 1.1
Crediting Period	2012 — 2112
VVB	Aster Global Environmental Solutions
Verified ERs	35,959 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	66 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

■ Multiple contradictions across documents on additionality, leakage treatment, safeguards, and credited volume reduce reliability.

■ The latest monitoring report shows no FPIC and no grievance mechanism, and 11 corrective actions were required.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined test rather than relying on a single weak screen.

- The latest monitoring report required 11 corrective actions, and the record contains contradictions on additionality, leakage, and reversal-related statements.

The project has some positive integrity signals: the VVB, Aster Global Environmental Solutions, confirmed additionality, the baseline is project-based, and the latest monitoring report reports no reversal events and a 10% buffer pool. At the same time, the latest monitoring report required 11 corrective actions, and the record contains contradictions on additionality test type, leakage treatment, and reversal-related statements, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the crediting basis.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and claimed and verified issuance volumes are both stated in the record.

- No usage monitoring method is stated, and the latest record does not show a baseline reassessment date or full public-facing MRV detail.

Transparency is moderate because the record includes a monitoring period, a named verifier, and matching claimed and verified issuance totals in the latest record. However, the usage monitoring method is not stated in the extracted documents, and no baseline reassessment date is found, so the MRV trail is incomplete.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ Leakage is quantified with a small deduction of 0.2%, which is better than leaving leakage unaddressed.

- The project is not CORSIA-eligible, and contradictions in credited volume and leakage treatment weaken confidence in over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is mixed. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk, and leakage is quantified at 0.2% with a stated justification. Still, contradictions in the credited volume between validation documents and the older leakage treatment, plus the absence of a usage monitoring method, leave residual over-crediting concern.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ The extracted record draws on multiple official document types, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance materials.

- Eleven corrective actions were required, and the record shows conflicting statements across documents, even though extraction confidence is high.

Documentation quality is fairly good because the extracted record spans validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance documents, and extraction confidence is high. Even so, the latest monitoring report lists 11 corrective actions, and several fields conflict across documents, so the documentation is not fully clean or internally consistent.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed but contradictory history
Permanence	Buffer pool present, no reversals reported
Leakage	Quantified leakage deduction
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism absent
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled document trail explaining the contradictions in credited volume, leakage treatment, and safeguard statements, with a clear hierarchy of which document governs each value.

→ Add a documented usage monitoring method, baseline reassessment date, and explicit social safeguards evidence including FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing details.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- AFOLU Project Element
- AFOLU Project Element Assessment
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Non-permanence risk report
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-0F50D1B8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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