

QUALITY REPORT

Agrocortex REDD Project

VCS-1686 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-0B45BFC1 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	4.3

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and a buffer pool, but the evidence base is incomplete and contains contradictions. Documentation quality is weakened by missing ERR spreadsheets and several key fields not being stated, which limits confidence in the issuance claim.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1686
Sector	redd
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VM0015 1.1
Crediting Period	2014 — 2044
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	27 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The VVB required the project proponent to provide ERR calculation spreadsheets, indicating incomplete review support.
- There are contradictions across documents on the buffer pool size, additionality test type, and whether reversal risk was addressed.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the issuance report cites a barrier test under VM0015.

- The VVB required ERR calculation spreadsheets for review, and the record shows contradictions on the additionality test type and buffer pool percentage.

The project shows moderate integrity because additionality was verified by Earthood Services Private Limited and the issuance report uses a barrier test under VM0015. Leakage is not ignored: the record states a quantified leakage deduction of 5%, and no reversal events are reported. However, the VVB still required the ERR calculation spreadsheets, which suggests unresolved review gaps, and the contradiction log shows disagreement over the additionality test type and buffer pool percentage.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated for 2020-01-01 to 2021-12-31, and the VVB is identified as Earthood Services Private Limited.

- Total ERR claimed and verified are not stated, usage monitoring is not described, and the extraction confidence is only medium.

Transparency is limited by missing core quantitative fields: total ERR claimed and verified are not stated, and the usage monitoring method is not found in the extracted record. The monitoring period is clear, and the VVB is named, but the extraction confidence is only medium, so some source material was not fully legible. That weakens confidence in the completeness of the public record.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ Leakage was quantified with a 5% deduction, which is better than an unaddressed leakage assumption.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and CORSIA eligibility is not stated, leaving residual over-crediting and double-claim uncertainty.

Claim safety is mixed. A quantified 5% leakage deduction and a buffer pool provide some protection, but the baseline is project-specific rather than a more standardized or jurisdictional approach, which increases over-crediting risk. CORSIA eligibility is not stated, and the contradictions around buffer pool size and additionality test type reduce reliability of the claim.

Documentation — 4.3 / 10

+ The record includes a substantial set of extracted documents and a named VVB, with safeguards such as FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing described.

- One or more key documents were not fully readable, and the VVB noted missing ERR calculation spreadsheets, reducing documentation completeness.

Documentation is only fair because the record includes many extracted documents and identifies the VVB, but key supporting materials were missing or not fully usable. The VVB explicitly requested ERR calculation spreadsheets, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than high. On the positive side, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are described, which improves completeness on safeguards.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed but conflicting test history
● Permanence	Buffer pool present, no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage quantified at 5%
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the ERR calculation spreadsheets and a complete reconciliation of claimed versus verified issuance.

→ Publish a clear baseline reassessment history and resolve the contradictions on buffer pool size and additionality test type.

Documents Reviewed

- VCS-PPIR_Agrocortex_2nd MR.pdf
- 1686_PRR_17NOV2022.docx
- Issuance Agrocortex.pdf
- Issuance Representation_Agrocortex.pdf
- VCS MR Agrocortex_period_01_01_07_2014_31_12_2016_v03.pdf
- VCS MR Agrocortex_period_03_01_01_2020_31_12_2021_v05_.pdf
- VCS MR Agrocortex_period_02_01_01_2017_31_12_2019_v03.pdf
- agrocortex (1).kml
- T&C;_Agrocortex_2nd MR.pdf
- Communications Agreement - Agrocortex vf_compressed.pdf
- VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Agrocortex REDD Project-MR 2-v03.pdf
- 1686_PRR_REG_10APR2018_CLOSED.pdf
- SCR_Agrocortex_Point_1_v3.pdf
- FVR_2017BQ20MD_rev2.0Aa_15122017.pdf
- VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report_Agrocortex REDD Project_v3.1.pdf
- Socialcarbon[1].pdf
- SCR_Agrocortex_Point_0_v2.pdf
- VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-Agrocortex REDD Project-MR 3-v02.pdf
- Registration Representation_Agrocortex.pdf
- VCS PD_Agrocortex REDD Project_v5.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v4.1_Agrocortex.pdf
- FINAL REPORT_VCSSocialCarbon-Verification-Report-Template-v4.0-1_Agrocortex.pdf
- VCS SocialCarbon-Verification-Report_Agrocortex.pdf
- VCS Verification Representation, v3.2_2017BQMD21.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-Agrocortex.pdf
- FVR 2017BQ21MD_ version 3Aa_20180511.pdf
- FVR_2017BQ22MD rev 3(2)Aa.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-0B45BFC1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy