QUALITY REPORT

Rotunda Forest Carbon Project

VCS-2386 · VCS · Romania

Report ID: CM-A007C59F · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.8
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.2
	Documentation (15%)	4.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some integrity strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage approach, a 12% buffer pool, and no reported reversals. However, the evidence base is incomplete on several key points, especially safeguards and baseline recency, and the record contains contradictions on FPIC, benefit sharing, and grievance mechanisms that reduce confidence. The project is registered under VCS and not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-claim risk, but the documentation quality is only moderate.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2386
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Romania
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VM0012 1.2
Crediting Period	2018 — 2047
VVB	SCS Global Services
Verified ERs	7,658 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- ■ Safeguards are poorly documented, and the record contradicts earlier evidence on FPIC, benefit sharing, and grievance mechanisms.
- ■ Baseline reassessment timing, leakage deduction details, and several monitoring inputs are not stated in the available documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the issuance record.

- Baseline reassessment timing is not stated, and leakage deduction details are not provided in the available documents.

The issuance record confirms additionality through an investment test and says the VVB verified it, which supports the project's core crediting logic. Integrity is helped by a 12% buffer pool, no reported reversal events, and a quantified leakage approach, but the actual leakage deduction is not stated and the baseline was project-specific. The baseline reassessment date is also not found in the available documents, which leaves some uncertainty about ongoing baseline validity.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The issuance record identifies the VVB as SCS Global Services and reports a verified issuance of 7,658 credits for the 2018-01-01 to 2020-12-31 monitoring period.

- Total credits claimed are not stated, and key monitoring details such as usage monitoring method are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is moderate because the issuance record identifies the verifier, the monitoring period, and the verified issuance amount of 7,658 credits. At the same time, total credits claimed are not stated, and the usage monitoring method is not found in the extracted record. The absence of a baseline reassessment date and other monitoring specifics limits how fully an outside reviewer can reconstruct the MRV trail.

Claim Safety — 6.2 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of double-claim risk.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and leakage treatment is not fully transparent because the deduction percentage is not stated.

Claim safety is supported by the project's non-CORSIA status, which lowers the risk of overlapping claims through that channel. However, the baseline is project-specific rather than standardized or jurisdictional, and the leakage deduction percentage is not stated even though leakage is said to be quantified. Because several usage and FNRB fields are not applicable or not stated, the over-crediting risk cannot be assessed as low with high confidence.

Documentation — 4.8 / 10

+ Ten documents were used, and the issuance record reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the record contains contradictions on FPIC, benefit sharing, and grievance mechanisms.

Documentation quality is only moderate. Ten documents were used, and the issuance record reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is positive. But extraction confidence is only medium, one evidence document is listed as unknown, and the record contains contradictions on FPIC, safeguards, benefit sharing, and grievance mechanisms; I privileged the later issuance record dated 2021-09-09 over the earlier 2021-08-30 record because it is more recent and appears to be the final issuance source.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	Buffer pool present, no reversals reported
Leakage	Quantified but deduction not stated
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
Safeguards	No safeguards documented in final record
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible and no CCP status stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the full monitoring and verification package with the leakage deduction, baseline reassessment history, and the missing usage-monitoring details.

→ Document FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing arrangements clearly in the final project record and resolve the contradictory earlier statements.

Documents Reviewed

- VCS-Issuance-Representation-Rotunda (Jun '21).pdf
- RV_2386_Project review report_09Sep2021.pdf
- VCS - Project Monitoring Report v2 - Rotunda (Aug '21).pdf
- VCS-Registration-Representation-Rotunda Jun'21 signed.pdf
- VCS-Listing-Rep-Nov20_v4.1_signed.pdf
- RotundaForestCarbonProject.kml
- VCS - Project Desc. (Listing) - Rotunda (Dec '20).pdf
- VCS - Project Desc. Doc. v4 - Rotunda (Aug '21).pdf
- VCS_GreenRaise_Rotunda_VerificationRepresentation_060721.pdf
- VCS_GreenRaise_Rotunda_ValidationRepresentation_060721.pdf
- VCS_GreenRaise_Rotunda_Joint-Validation-Verification_V1-2_081621.pdf

Report ID: CM-A007C59F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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