QUALITY REPORT

Afforestation in Eucalyptus and Acacia plantations for Burapha Agroforestry Co., Ltd.

VCS-2367 · VCS · Lao

Report ID: CM-A2189CD0 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.3
Transparency (25%)	4.8
Claim Safety (25%)	4.4
Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a 10% buffer pool, and no material findings reported in the latest monitoring record. However, there are important reliability and claim-safety concerns: leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, reversal events are reported, and several key items are either missing or contradictory across documents. Overall, this looks like a moderately documented project with meaningful uncertainty around permanence and crediting consistency.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2367
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Lao
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0003 2
Crediting Period	2016 — 2036
VVB	Earthood
Verified ERs	163,075 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

■ Leakage is marked as not addressed in the latest monitoring record, despite the project type normally requiring a clear treatment.

■ Reversal events are reported, and the buffer pool level conflicts with an earlier 20% value in the contradiction log.

■ Key transparency fields such as usage monitoring method, claimed ERRs, and CORSIA/CCP status are not stated in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.3 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the monitoring record cites a combined additionality test.

- Reversal events are reported, and the latest record shows leakage as not addressed rather than clearly quantified.

The latest monitoring report dated 2025-04-04 shows additionality confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which supports the project's core crediting logic. At the same time, reversal events are reported and the record discusses non-permanence risk and buffer determination, so permanence is not risk-free. Leakage is a concern because the extracted record says it is not addressed, even though the project type would normally require a clear leakage treatment.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The latest monitoring report is dated 2025-04-04, with a defined monitoring period and verified emissions reductions of 163,075.

- Several transparency-critical items are not stated in available documents, including the usage monitoring method, claimed ERRs, and registry eligibility status.

The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2020-12-23 to 2022-12-31, and the report provides a verified emissions reduction figure of 163,075. However, the claimed emissions reductions are not stated, the usage monitoring method is missing, and CORSIA/CCP status is not found in the extracted record. That leaves important gaps in public-facing MRV completeness and registry clarity.

Claim Safety — 4.4 / 10

+ The project uses a recognized VCS afforestation methodology, and the VVB reported no material findings.

- Leakage treatment is weak in the extracted record, and the contradiction log shows disagreement on leakage justification and buffer pool size.

Claim safety is weakened by the lack of a clear leakage justification in the latest record and by the reported reversal events. The project does have a recognized VCS methodology and no material findings were reported, which helps, but the contradiction log shows disagreement on leakage justification and buffer pool size. Because the latest monitoring report is the most recent source, I privileged its leakage treatment and 10% buffer pool value, but the inconsistency still lowers confidence in over-crediting risk controls.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ Eighteen documents were used, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- The evidence list is not specific, and several core fields are missing or not stated, including baseline reassessment timing and usage monitoring details.

Documentation quality is moderate: eighteen documents were used and extraction confidence is medium, so the record is not severely degraded. The latest monitoring report is recent, but several important items remain missing or not stated, including baseline reassessment timing, usage monitoring details, and registry eligibility status. The evidence list is also not specific, which limits auditability even though no corrective actions were required.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Buffer present but reversal events reported
Leakage	Leakage not addressed clearly
Baseline	Project baseline with no reassessment date
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear, quantified leakage assessment and reconcile it with the earlier document that reportedly quantified leakage.

→ Resolve the contradictions on buffer pool size, additionality test type, and crediting period, and provide a complete registry/eligibility statement.

Documents Reviewed

- VCS issuance deed of representation 2024-02-29 amended.pdf
- PRR_2367_v3_08.03.2023.pdf
- ISS_REP_2367_22052023..pdf
- VCS_V2_PRR_2367_27APR2025.pdf
- Burapha_Second_Monitoring_Report_v2.3 04042025 (clean).pdf
- MON_REP2367_31052016_22122020.pdf
- 2021-02-08_PD_Monitoring_Burapha_VCS.pdf
- NPRR_2367_03052023.pdf
- Burapha_Second_Monitoring_Calculation_v3 07022025.xlsx
- PP_REG_REP2367_03052022.pdf
- 2020-12-22_Burapha_Risk-Report_PD-M1_final.pdf
- Bafco_merged plant_10-07-20.kml
- Burapha_Risk-Report_MR2 v4.2 20250402 (clean).pdf
- VCS-Listing-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1_Buarpha v1.pdf
- Verification-Representation_Earthood.pdf
- VCS 2367_Burapha_Ver_FVR_20250404_Clean.pdf
- VALID_STA2367_20042022.pdf
- VERIF_REP_2367_31052016_22122020.pdf
- VERIF_STA_2367_22052023.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-A2189CD0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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