QUALITY REPORT

Afforestation and restoration of degraded forests in Eastern Paraguay or Forestal Azul Carbon Project

VCS-2469 · VCS · Paraguay

Report ID: CM-2616F3B8 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.4
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
	Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS afforestation project with VVB-confirmed additionality, a buffer pool, and no reported reversals, which supports a moderate integrity profile. However, the record contains several contradictions, a low extraction-confidence flag, and multiple corrective actions, which reduce confidence in the documentation and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2469
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Paraguay
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0003 2
Crediting Period	2018 — 2038
VVB	TÜV SUD South Asia Private Limited
Verified ERs	78,494 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The record contains contradictions on buffer pool size, leakage treatment, additionality test type, reversal treatment, and verified issuance totals.
- Three corrective actions were required, and the extraction confidence is low, indicating documentation quality concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by TÜV SUD South Asia Private Limited, and the project uses a combined additionality test under AR-ACM0003.

- The issuance record shows contradictions on buffer pool percentage, leakage justification, reversal treatment, and verified ER totals, which weakens reliability.

The verification record confirms additionality through a combined test and names TÜV SUD South Asia Private Limited as the VVB, which is a meaningful positive signal. The project also reports a 12% buffer pool and no reported reversal events, supporting permanence. However, the record contains contradictions on buffer pool size, leakage treatment, reversal handling, and verified issuance totals, so the integrity score is held back by reliability concerns.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period, crediting period, registry status, VVB name, and claimed versus verified issuance figures are available in the issuance record.

- Usage monitoring details are not stated, and the low extraction confidence suggests at least one key document was difficult to read.

The issuance record provides the monitoring period, crediting period, registry status, VVB identity, and both claimed and verified ER totals, which supports basic transparency. At the same time, the usage monitoring method is not stated in available documents, and the extraction confidence is low, suggesting incomplete or hard-to-read source material. The presence of multiple corrective actions also reduces confidence in the completeness of the public record.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

+ Leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction, and the project is an afforestation/restoration activity with no reported reversals.

- The verified issuance total differs from the claimed total, and the contradictory leakage and additionality entries raise over-crediting and reporting-risk concerns.

Claim safety is helped by the project type, the negligible leakage treatment with a 0% deduction, and the absence of reported reversals. Still, the verified issuance total differs from the claimed total, and the contradictions on leakage justification and additionality test type create uncertainty about how robust the crediting basis is. Because CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ Seventeen documents were used, and the record includes the VVB, monitoring window, and issuance date.

- Three corrective actions were required, the evidence list is not specific, and the extraction confidence is low.

The record draws on 17 documents and includes a recent issuance date, which is a positive sign for documentation coverage. However, the evidence list is not specific, the extraction confidence is low, and three corrective actions were required, all of which point to documentation weaknesses. The available record is usable, but not strong enough to inspire high confidence.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
Permanence	buffer pool present, no reversals reported
Leakage	0% deduction with contradictory justification
Baseline	project baseline, reassessed in 2023
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clean reconciliation note explaining the contradictions in buffer pool, leakage, reversal treatment, and verified issuance totals.

→ Provide explicit usage monitoring methodology and clarify CORSIA eligibility and CCP status in the registry-facing documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance-Representation-Single-PP-v4.3_FASA-signed-signed.pdf
- Contrato - VCS ISSUANCE DEED OF REPRESENTATION BY Forestal Azul S.A..pdf
- VCS_V_R2_2469_PRR_17APRIL2024.pdf
- 20231222 Monitoring Report FASA.pdf
- 20240327 Monitoring Report FASA_CC.pdf
- 2023-03-01 VCS Joint PDD FASA_ver 3_clean.pdf
- VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-FASA.pdf
- 20231221 FASA Ex-post carbon calculation M2.xlsx
- UNIQUE VCS-Listing-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1_Forestal Azul.pdf
- FASA_first_instc_out_bound.kml
- Contrato - VCS REGISTRATION DEED OF REPRESENTATION BY Forestal Azul S.A..pdf
- R3_2469_PRR_15MAR2023.pdf
- 2021-03-01 VCS Joint PDD FASA.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v4.1_Azul.pdf
- Verification Representation-v4.2_2469.pdf
- FVR_2469_Ver1.2_040424_CC.pdf
- VCS-Validation-Representation-v4.1_Azul.pdf
- FVVR_2023-03-03-FValVerR_Azul_PRR_clean.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-2616F3B8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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