


QUALITY REPORT

Ecomapua Amazon REDD Project

VCS-1094 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-04040613 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-verified additionality, a quantified leakage treatment, and a 10% buffer pool. However, the registry status is on hold, reversal treatment is not clearly addressed, and several key monitoring details are missing or inconsistent, which weakens confidence in the claimed credits.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1094
Sector	redd
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VM0015 1.1
Crediting Period	2003 — 2032
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd
Verified ERs	1,448,333 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2003 — 2012
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	34 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- Registry status is on hold, which raises immediate claim and issuance risk.
- Reversal risk is not clearly addressed in the extracted record, despite the project being a REDD activity.
- Contradictions exist on buffer pool size, FPIC, safeguards, benefit sharing, grievance mechanism, and reversal treatment across documents.
- Low extraction confidence and missing monitoring details reduce trust in the documentation.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which is a meaningful positive signal.

- Reversal treatment is not clearly addressed in the extracted record, and the project is a REDD project where permanence matters.

The project has some solid integrity features: the verification report/issuance record identifies additionality as confirmed through an investment test, and the record shows a quantified leakage treatment plus a 10% buffer pool. At the same time, reversal risk is not clearly addressed in the extracted record, which is a material weakness for a REDD project. The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and the last reassessment date is not found in the available documents.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period and crediting period are stated, and the VVB is identified as Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.

- Key MRV details such as the usage monitoring method, leakage deduction percentage, and baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents.

Transparency is mixed. The record identifies the VVB, monitoring period, and crediting period, but key MRV details such as the usage monitoring method, leakage deduction percentage, and baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents. The low extraction confidence also suggests at least one key source was difficult to read, which lowers trust in the completeness of the documentation.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is marked not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of claim overlap risk.

- The registry status is on hold, and the extracted record does not provide a clear claim-quantity reconciliation because claimed ERRs are not stated.

Claim safety is weakened by the registry being on hold, which is an important external risk signal. The project is marked not CORSIA-eligible, which helps reduce dual-channel claim risk, but the extracted record does not provide a clear reconciliation between claimed and verified emission reductions because the claimed total is not stated. The absence of a clear leakage deduction and the project-specific baseline also leave some over-crediting uncertainty.

Documentation — 3.2 / 10

+ A relatively large number of documents were used, and the record includes an issuance document dated 2025-12-08.

- Extraction confidence is low, and several important fields are missing or only partially specified in the available documents.

Documentation quality is limited by low extraction confidence and several missing fields, including baseline reassessment timing, usage monitoring method, and leakage deduction percentage. The record does show a substantial document set and a recent issuance date, which helps, but the contradictions across documents reduce reliability. In particular, later documents appear to support 10% buffer pool, FPIC, safeguards, benefit sharing, and a grievance mechanism, while earlier documents reported the opposite or were silent; I privileged the later-dated entries because they are more recent, but the contradictions still warrant a downward adjustment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Buffer pool present, reversal treatment unclear
● Leakage	Leakage quantified but deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and safeguards present but contradicted
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear, reconciled monitoring package showing claimed versus verified ERs, leakage deduction, and baseline reassessment history.

→ Resolve document contradictions and provide explicit, dated evidence for permanence treatment, FPIC, safeguards, and grievance procedures.

Documents Reviewed

- PP_ISS_REP_1094_01JAN2003_31DEC2012.pdf
- VCS PPIR_2nd MR_Ecomapua.pdf
- 1ISS_PRR_1094_27Jan2015.pdf
- VCS MR Ecomapua_period_02_01_01_2013_31_12_2017_v04.pdf
- MONIT_REP_1094_01JAN2003_31DEC2012.pdf
- VCS_MR_Ecomapua_period_01_01_01_2003_31_12_2012_v02.pdf
- doc.kml
- Buffer release_Project1094_Nov2020.pdf
- T&C;_EcomapuC!_2nd MR.pdf
- COMMS_AGR_1094_27MAY2013.pdf
- VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report_EcomapuC! Amazon REDD Project_2nd MR_v4.pdf
- 1094, New Review Notification Letter, 08DEC2025.pdf
- AFOLU_ELEM_1094_01JAN2003_31DEC2012.pdf
- VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report_EcomapuC! Amazon REDD Project_2nd baseline period_v2.pdf
- SCR_Ecomapua_Point0_v3.pdf
- VCS_Non-Permanence_Risk_Report_Ecomapuá_Amazon_REDD_Project_v2.pdf
- VCS_Verification_Report_Ecomapuá_REDD_Project_ver_1.2Aa_30072014_20.10.2014.pdf
- SCR_Ecomapua_Point01_v03.pdf
- PP_REG_REP_1094_27MAY2013.pdf
- SC_T-C_1094_01JAN2003_31DEC2012.pdf
- PP_ACC_REP_1094_10OCT2014.pdf
- SC_REP_POINT_ZERO_1094_01JAN2003_31DEC2012.pdf
- AFOLU_ELEM_1094_15FEB2013.pdf
- VCS PD_EcomapuC!_2nd baseline period_v02.pdf
- PROJ_DESC_1094_22FEB2013.pdf
- VCS_Verification_Representation,_v3.1_(1)_Ecomapua.pdf
- VCSSocialCarbon-Verification-Report-Carbon Check_Ecomapua_24062020_revised.pdf
- VERIF_REP_1094_01JAN2003_31DEC2012.pdf
- SC_VALID_REP_POINT_ZERO_1094_01JAN2003_31DEC2012.pdf
- VALID_STA_1094_06MAR2013.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v4.1_Ecomapua.pdf
- VALID_REP_1094_06MAR2013.pdf
- FVRP_SCS_2014BQ02MD_2.2Aa_18.11.2016_approved.pdf
- VERIF_STA_1094_01JAN2003_31DEC2012.pdf

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-04040613 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy