QUALITY REPORT

Yacumama Forest Carbon Project

VCS-1133 · VCS · Peru

Report ID: CM-36C9AC3E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
	Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some strong structural elements for an avoidance project, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a relatively high buffer pool contribution with no reversals reported. However, leakage treatment appears inconsistent and potentially erroneous in the extracted record, and key quantification fields (verified ERs, baseline reassessment timing) are missing, increasing over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1133
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Peru
Vintage	2013
Project Methodology	VM0007 1.5
Crediting Period	2012 — 2041
VVB	Environmental Services, Inc.
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Leakage is listed as 17,500% while leakage justification is not addressed in the monitoring report, suggesting a serious data reliability or extraction issue that could materially affect credited volumes.

■ Verified and claimed emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess MRV accuracy and over-crediting risk.

■ Baseline is described as project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated, which weakens confidence over a long crediting period (2012–2041).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation report confirms additionality using a common-practice test and indicates it was confirmed by the VVB.

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents and the monitoring report does not address leakage justification despite a very large leakage deduction value in the extracted record.

The validation report confirms additionality via a common-practice test and indicates it was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. Permanence risk management appears comparatively strong for an avoidance project, with a 33% buffer pool contribution and no reversals reported in the extracted record. Integrity is weakened by leakage: the monitoring report indicates leakage justification is not addressed, yet the extracted record shows an extreme leakage deduction value, and the validation report is described as having quantified leakage—these inconsistencies reduce confidence in net crediting.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and a VVB is named (Environmental Services, Inc.).

- The extracted record does not include claimed or verified emission reductions, limiting transparency on MRV outcomes for the 2014–2022 monitoring period.

The extracted record includes a defined monitoring period (2014-01-01 to 2022-12-31) and identifies the VVB (Environmental Services, Inc.), which supports basic traceability. However, neither total claimed nor total verified emission reductions are found in the extracted record, preventing an assessment of whether verification outcomes align with claims. The baseline is described as project-specific and the date of any baseline reassessment is not stated, limiting transparency on how baseline validity is maintained over time.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims screening.

- Contradictory leakage information (quantified vs not addressed) and missing ER totals elevate over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Downstream claim safety is constrained because CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily screen for program-eligibility-related claim risks. Over-crediting risk is elevated by the inconsistent leakage narrative (monitoring report does not address leakage justification while the validation report is described as quantified) and by the absence of extracted claimed/verified ER totals. The long crediting period (2012–2041) combined with no stated baseline reassessment timing further increases uncertainty around the durability of baseline assumptions.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Extraction confidence is high and the record references 10 documents including key project-cycle documents.

- Several critical quantitative fields are missing (claimed/verified ERs, baseline reassessment timing), and multiple contradictions indicate document-to-document inconsistency.

Documentation coverage is moderate-to-good: the evidence list includes the PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance, and the extraction confidence is high with 10 documents used. Nonetheless, key quantitative outputs (claimed and verified ER totals) are not found in the extracted record, and several safeguards-related fields show contradictions against an older/unknown source. The presence of multiple contradictions suggests either document evolution over time or inconsistent reporting, which reduces documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed common-practice test
Permanence	33% buffer; no reversals reported
Leakage	Inconsistent and poorly justified leakage treatment
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance reported, but inconsistent sources
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verified and claimed emission reductions for the monitoring period (with verification/issuance references) so MRV outcomes can be checked against claims.

→ Clarify leakage treatment with a consistent, document-backed explanation and correct/confirm the leakage deduction value, including how it is applied to net credited ERs.

→ Disclose when and how the baseline was last reassessed (or justify why reassessment is not required) given the long crediting period.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- AFOLU Project Element
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-36C9AC3E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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