QUALITY REPORT

Fortaleza Ituxi REDD Project

VCS-1654 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-9EE2D656 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.9 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	4.2
Transparency (25%)	3.8
Claim Safety (25%)	3.6
Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

This REDD project has some positive elements, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a 10% buffer pool, FPIC, and a quantified leakage deduction. However, the record also shows major verification weaknesses, including a missing non-permanence risk report, non-eligible areas in the project boundary, and unresolved calculation reproducibility issues. The registry status is on hold, which further weakens confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1654
Sector	redd
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VM0015 version 1.1
Crediting Period	2013 — 2043
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	176,038 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	28 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- ■ The verification report lists a missing non-permanence risk report and 8 assessment findings, with several corrective actions still required.
- ■ The project boundary and accounting appear problematic because non-eligible areas were included in the KML file and the emissions calculation could not be reproduced from the submitted materials.
- ■ There are material contradictions across documents on buffer pool size, reversal events, credited emissions, and the crediting period.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which is stronger than an unverified claim.

- The verification report reports a missing non-permanence risk report, non-eligible areas inside the project area, and 8 assessment findings that still needed resolution.

The project has a positive additionality signal because the VVB confirmed an investment test, and the monitoring record shows a quantified leakage deduction of 5% plus a 10% buffer pool in the latest extracted facts. Against that, the verification report states that the non-permanence risk report was not submitted, non-eligible areas were included inside the project area, and the VVB raised 8 assessment findings with corrective actions still outstanding. The September 2021 fire was reportedly contained without significant damage, so I did not treat it as a confirmed reversal, but the earlier contradiction about reported reversals still lowers confidence. Overall, the integrity picture is mixed and weakened by boundary and permanence-control issues.

Transparency — 3.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period, VVB name, and verified emission reductions are stated in the available record, and the project has a named verifier.

- The report says there was not sufficient information to reproduce the net GHG emission reductions calculation, and key public-facing fields such as usage monitoring details are not stated.

The project has some basic transparency elements: a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and a verified emissions figure in the extracted record. However, the verification report explicitly says there was not sufficient information to reproduce the net GHG emission reductions calculation, and the usage monitoring method is not stated in available documents. Several registry-relevant fields are also missing from the extracted record, which limits public traceability. This is below average transparency for a forestry crediting project.

Claim Safety — 3.6 / 10

+ Leakage is treated with a quantified 5% deduction, which is better than leaving leakage unaddressed.

- The project is on hold and the record contains contradictions on credited emissions, buffer pool size, and reversal history, increasing over-crediting and claim-risk concerns.

Claim safety is constrained by the on-hold registry status and by contradictions in the record. I privileged the most recent extracted values where they appear to come from later documents, but the contradictions on credited emissions, buffer pool percentage, reversal events, and crediting period indicate reliability problems that increase over-crediting risk. The quantified leakage deduction helps, but the project-specific baseline and unresolved accounting issues keep the claim-safety score low. I did not see evidence of dual registration or double issuance, but CORSIA and CCP status are not stated.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ The record draws on many documents, with 27 documents used and medium extraction confidence rather than low.

- Several required items are missing or only partially documented, including the non-permanence risk report and reproducible calculation appendices.

Documentation breadth is moderate because 27 documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low. Even so, the record is incomplete on several important points: the non-permanence risk report is missing, the calculation appendix was not sufficient for reproduction, and some monitoring details are not stated. The project also has multiple contradictions across documents, which reduces trust in the documentation set. The recency of the monitoring period is reasonably good, but the unresolved findings prevent a stronger score.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	buffer pool present but reversal history disputed
● **Leakage**	quantified 5% leakage deduction
● **Baseline**	project baseline with reassessment timing not stated
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Upload the missing non-permanence risk report and close all outstanding corrective actions with clear evidence in the registry.

→ Provide a fully reproducible emissions calculation package, cleanly delineated KML boundaries, and a reconciled explanation for the contradictions in buffer pool, reversals, credited emissions, and crediting period.

Documents Reviewed

- VCS-Issuance-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1-Ituxi.pdf
- 1654_PRR_V1_15MAR2023.pdf
- VCS-Issuance-Representation-Multiple-Representors-v4.1.d_ituxiocx.docx.pdf
- PP_ISS_REP_1654_15DEC2013_TO_14DEC2015.pdf
- !ITUXI_Monitoring Report2_06_01_2021.pdf
- VCS-Monitoring-Report MR3-ITUXI-v4.4.pdf
- MONIT_REP_1654_15DEC2013_TO_14DEC2015.pdf
- PA_ITUXI.kml
- RE_ 1654 Vintages.pdf
- Fortaleza_Ituxi_VCS_Verif_18_EN.pdf
- PP_REG_REP_1654_30MAY2019.pdf
- PP_LIST_REP_PL1654_13APR2017.pdf
- Verra-Registry-Communications-Agreement-single-PP-4753632-v1-SYDDMS-Ituxi.pdf
- VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Fortaleza Ituxi MR3_2.2.pdf
- RI_PRR_1654_07AUG2019.pdf
- Registration_Deed_Representation_Ituxi_2019-05-30_190416.pdf
- 1654_New Review Notification Letter_13 June 2024.pdf
- DRAFT_PROJ_DESC_PL1654_28SEP2016.pdf
- PROJ_DESC_1654_01JUL2019.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v4.1_Ituxi.pdf
- FINAL_Fortaleza_Ituxi_VCS_Valid_Final_20190517.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v4.1.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Clean_01032023.pdf
- Fortalexa_Ituxi_VCS_Validation_Representation_20190517.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v3.3.pdf
- VALID_REP_1654_30MAR2019.pdf
- VERIFICATION REPORT 2 fortaleza ituxi redd 120320.pdf
- VERIF_REP_1654_15DEC2013_TO_14DEC2015.pdf

Report ID: CM-9EE2D656 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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