QUALITY REPORT

For Peat’s Sake

VCS-1477 · VCS · Indonesia

Report ID: CM-F4ABAABB · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	6.8
Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
Documentation (15%)	7.6

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, but it also reports fire impacts that reduce credited outcomes. Several cross-document inconsistencies (especially around reversals, leakage framing, and ERR figures) increase uncertainty and raise over-crediting and communications risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1477
Sector	redd
Country	Indonesia
Vintage	2020
Project Methodology	VM0007 1.8
Crediting Period	2010 — 2070
VVB	AENOR
Verified ERs	5,703,688 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	58 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Reversal reporting is inconsistent across monitoring reports, while the latest report also describes three fires affecting emission reductions (489,842 tCO2e).

■ Leakage is stated as quantified but the leakage deduction is 0%, and earlier monitoring framed leakage as negligible—this inconsistency weakens confidence in leakage treatment.

■ Large discrepancies in claimed/verified ERR figures across validation documents (2017 vs 2019) indicate data reliability issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the validation documentation, and a buffer contribution of 10% is stated in the monitoring record.

- Fire impacts are explicitly reported (489,842 tCO2e), and inconsistencies in reversal and leakage treatment reduce confidence in permanence and net ER accounting.

The validation documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project applies a project-specific baseline approach under VM0007. The monitoring report (2025) states a 10% buffer contribution, but also reports three fires that affected emission reductions by 489,842 tCO2e, indicating non-trivial disturbance risk. Leakage is presented as quantified in the monitoring report (2025) yet the leakage deduction is 0%, and earlier monitoring (2020) framed leakage as negligible, which weakens confidence in net ER conservativeness.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2025) provides a clear monitoring period (2021–2023) and reports identical claimed and verified ERs for that period (5,703,688 tCO2e).

- Contradictory ER figures and shifting leakage/reversal statements across documents reduce MRV clarity for external users.

The monitoring report dated 2025-06-27 clearly states the monitoring period (2021-01-01 to 2023-12-31) and reports claimed and verified emission reductions as the same value (5,703,688 tCO2e). The VVB is identified (AENOR), supporting audit traceability. However, the extracted record shows multiple inconsistencies across documents (including ER totals and reversal/leakage statements), which reduces the clarity and comparability of the public MRV narrative.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is identified as CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, which can support certain buyer use-cases if properly communicated.

- CORSIA eligibility increases the need for careful claims controls, and contradictions in ER and reversal/leakage reporting elevate perceived over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is marked as CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, which can increase downstream claims sensitivity and the need for precise, non-overstated marketing. Over-crediting risk is elevated by inconsistent ER figures across validation documents and by mixed messaging on reversals and leakage across monitoring reports. The absence of a stated CCP status in the extracted record leaves uncertainty for buyers seeking CCP-aligned claims.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ A large document set was used (57) including PDD, validation, monitoring, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence.

- Presence of an “unknown” source in the evidence set and multiple contradictions suggest some recordkeeping/traceability weaknesses.

The evidence base is relatively strong in volume and coverage (57 documents including PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance), and the minimum extraction confidence is high, suggesting the underlying documents were readable. The monitoring report is recent (2025), improving recency for the latest monitoring period. Nonetheless, the presence of an “unknown” document source and the number of contradictions indicate documentation/record consistency issues that should be resolved for higher confidence.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality (test type inconsistently described)
● **Permanence**	Buffer stated (10%) but fire impacts reported and reversal reporting inconsistent
● **Leakage**	0% deduction with inconsistent justification across monitoring reports
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not found
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented in latest monitoring report
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation table across all periods showing claimed vs verified ERs, treatment of fire impacts, and how any reversals were handled (including buffer interactions).

→ Provide a consistent, quantified leakage assessment that explains why the leakage deduction is 0% and aligns language across monitoring reports, plus disclose baseline reassessment timing.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- CCB Monitoring Report Draft
- CCB MR Summary Draft
- Monitoring Report
- CCB Monitoring Report
- CCB MR Summary
- Confidential
- Registration Representation
- AFOLU Project Element
- PIR Summary
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- CCB Verification Report
- Verification Report
- CCB Verification Statement

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-F4ABAABB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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