

QUALITY REPORT

# The Russas Project

VCS-1112 · Verified Carbon Standard · Brazil

Report ID: CM-EA259E7E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>5.9</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.2</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>6.1</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>6.4</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.3</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a VCS REDD avoidance project using VM0007 with VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated buffer contribution, which supports basic integrity. However, key risk controls are inconsistently documented across project documents (buffer percentage, reversal treatment, and safeguards), and leakage is said to be quantified but the actual leakage deduction is not provided in the extracted record.

## Project Details

Registry	Verified Carbon Standard
Registry ID	VCS-1112
Sector	redd
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2020
Project Methodology	VM0007 1.4
Crediting Period	2011 — 2041
VVB	Aster Global Environmental Solutions
Verified ERs	174,227 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	88 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Buffer pool contribution is inconsistent across documents (10% in a monitoring report vs 15% in an older, unidentified document), raising reliability concerns for permanence risk management.
- Reversal events are inconsistently treated ("none reported" in the validation report vs "not addressed" in a monitoring report), which weakens confidence in non-permanence monitoring.
- Leakage is described as quantified in the 2023 monitoring report, but the leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record and the PDD did not address leakage.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB and assessed via a common-practice test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record; reversal monitoring/treatment is also inconsistent across documents.

The project is an avoidance REDD activity under VM0007 with additionality confirmed by the VVB using a common-practice test, which supports the additionality case. Permanence risk management is mixed: a buffer pool contribution is stated, but the percentage is inconsistent across documents (10% in a monitoring report versus 15% in an older unidentified document). Reversal events are not consistently handled in the record, with a monitoring report indicating reversals were not addressed while the validation report states none were reported, which weakens confidence in non-permanence monitoring. Leakage is described as quantified in the 2023 monitoring report, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, limiting assurance that leakage was conservatively applied.

### Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ A recent monitoring report (dated 2023-09-13) provides a clear monitoring period (2018-01-01 to 2020-12-31) and a verified ER volume of 174,227 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

- The claimed ER total is not found in the extracted record, and several key quantified parameters (e.g., leakage deduction percent) are missing despite being referenced as quantified.

The monitoring report dated 2023-09-13 clearly states the monitoring period (2018-01-01 to 2020-12-31) and provides a verified emissions reduction figure of 174,227 tCO<sub>2</sub>e. However, the claimed emissions reductions are not found in the extracted record, making it harder to reconcile what was requested versus what was verified. Leakage is said to be quantified in the monitoring report, but the absence of the leakage deduction percentage in the extracted record reduces MRV transparency. The presence of issuance documentation in the evidence list supports registry traceability, but contradictions across documents reduce overall transparency confidence.

### Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim and some double-claiming exposure.

- Over-crediting risk remains due to missing claimed ER figures and incomplete leakage quantification in the extracted record, plus multiple cross-document contradictions.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation-related claims and some double-claiming concerns. Nonetheless, over-crediting risk cannot be fully ruled out because the extracted record lacks the claimed ER total and does not provide the leakage deduction percentage even though leakage is described as quantified in the monitoring report (2023-09-13). The baseline is project-specific and baseline reassessment timing is not found in the extracted record, which can increase discretion and perceived over-crediting risk. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on that label as an external quality screen.

## Documentation — 6.3 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (69 documents) including PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance records.

- Extraction confidence is only medium and several core safeguards fields contradict between the validation report and the monitoring report, reducing confidence in document consistency.

The extracted record indicates a substantial documentation base (69 documents) including a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance records, which is a positive for completeness. However, minimum extraction confidence is only medium, implying some limitations in readability or extraction quality. Several safeguards-related items (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, and safeguards mention) conflict between the validation report (2019-05-06) and the monitoring report (2023-09-13), indicating either evolving practices or inconsistent reporting. These inconsistencies reduce confidence that the documentation set is internally coherent.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed common-practice test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Buffer stated but reversal treatment inconsistent
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage said quantified; deduction not evidenced here
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC reported but contradict validation
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and reconcile the exact leakage deduction applied (percent and calculation) in the monitoring/verification package and ensure it is consistently reflected across PDD and monitoring reports.

→ Provide a clear, consistent statement of buffer pool contribution and reversal monitoring outcomes for the monitoring period, with cross-references to registry/buffer account evidence and any non-permanence risk updates.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- CCB Monitoring Report
- CCB Monitoring Report Draft
- CCB MR Summary Draft
- CCB MR Summary
- Registration Review Report
- AFOLU Project Element
- Registration Representation
- AFOLU Project Element Assessment
- Communications Agreement
- PIR Summary
- Project Implementation Report
- Non-permanence risk report
- PDD Summary
- Project Description
- CCB Verification Statement
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- CCB Validation Statement
- CCB Verification Report
- CCB Validation 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-EA259E7E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)