

QUALITY REPORT

Jari Pará REDD+ Project

VCS-1811 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-973AC469 · 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%)	5.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows several integrity positives typical of REDD+ under VCS, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a non-trivial buffer pool contribution. However, key baseline and leakage quantification details are missing in the extracted record, and the document set shows internal inconsistency on whether leakage was addressed, which increases over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1811
Sector	redd
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2014
Project Methodology	VM0015 1.1
Crediting Period	2014 — 2044
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	1,012,082 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	34 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and timing of baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record, despite being central to REDD+ credit integrity.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (validation report says not addressed; monitoring report says quantified), and the leakage deduction percentage is not provided.
- Reversal events are marked as not addressed in the extracted record, even though permanence risk management is critical for REDD+.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation in the extracted record).

- Baseline method and baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, and reversal events are not addressed.

The extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (Earthood Services Private Limited), which supports additionality robustness. Permanence risk management is partially evidenced by an 11% buffer pool contribution, but reversal events are marked as not addressed in the extracted record, leaving a key integrity element unclear. Baseline integrity cannot be fully assessed because the baseline method and the date of last baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record, which is a major uncertainty for a REDD+ avoidance project.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Claimed and verified emission reductions match (1,012,082), suggesting consistent MRV totals in the monitoring/verification record.

- Leakage is described inconsistently across documents and key quantification (leakage deduction percent) is missing from the extracted record.

The monitoring period is clearly stated (2017-10-23 to 2023-03-06) and the total emission reductions claimed equal the total verified (both 1,012,082) in the extracted record, which supports MRV consistency at the headline level. However, leakage reporting is not consistently described across the document set and the leakage deduction percentage is not provided in the extracted record, limiting reproducibility of the net credit calculation. The presence of many clarifications and corrective actions also suggests the audit trail may have required substantial follow-up to reach a final verified figure.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ Leakage is at least described as quantified in the monitoring report, which is directionally better than assuming zero without analysis.

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and baseline/leakage detail gaps elevate over-crediting and claims risk.

Over-crediting risk remains moderate because core REDD+ drivers—baseline approach and leakage deductions—are not fully visible in the extracted record. The monitoring report indicates leakage was quantified, which is preferable to an unsubstantiated 0% leakage assumption, but the absence of the actual leakage deduction percentage prevents an independent reasonableness check. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so downstream claim compatibility and double-claim channel risk cannot be confidently characterized.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (31 documents) including a monitoring report, validation report, and PDD.

- The monitoring/verification process required numerous clarifications and corrective actions, indicating documentation and/or controls weaknesses.

Documentation coverage appears relatively strong in breadth, with 31 documents used and key types present (monitoring report, validation report, and PDD). Extraction confidence is medium, which is acceptable but still implies some risk of missed details. The monitoring/verification record notes extensive follow-up (10 clarifications, 11 corrective actions, and a further action request related to CCB validation), which weakens confidence in initial documentation quality even if issues were ultimately resolved.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Buffer pool stated, reversals not addressed
● Leakage	Leakage mentioned but inconsistent and not fully quantified
● Baseline	Baseline approach not found in extracted record
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose (or extract) the baseline method and the most recent baseline reassessment date from the PDD/monitoring/verification package, with clear justification under VM0015 v1.1.

→ Provide the quantified leakage results including the leakage deduction percentage and calculation inputs, and reconcile the validation vs monitoring inconsistency explicitly in the public documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- CCB Monitoring Report Draft
- CCB MR Summary Draft
- Public Commentary
- Registration Review Report
- AFOLU Project Element
- CCB PD Summary
- Listing Representation
- CCB PD Summary Draft
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- CCB Project Description
- Project Description
- CCB Project Description Draft
- Draft Project Description
- Validation / Verification Report
- CCB Validation Statement
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- CCB Validation Report
- 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-973AC469 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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