

## QUALITY REPORT

# Agroforestry and reforestation with small-scale farmers in Uganda

VCS-2471 · VCS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-86DA7210 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.8**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.8</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.1</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.6</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS agroforestry/reforestation project with VVB-confirmed additionality, a 10% buffer pool, and no material findings reported in the issuance record. However, several key MRV details are missing or only partially documented, and there are contradictions around leakage treatment and reversal-event handling that reduce confidence in the claims.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2471
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AR AMS0007 3.1
Crediting Period	2016 — 2051
VVB	AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: one source says leakage was deemed negligible, while another indicates it was quantified.
- Reversal-event handling is not fully consistent: one document says none were reported, while another suggests the issue was not addressed.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test, which supports the project's baseline credibility.

- Leakage and reversal treatment are not fully consistent across documents, and the baseline has not been shown to have been recently reassessed.

The issuance record shows additionality was confirmed by the VVB through a barrier test, which is a meaningful positive for project integrity. The project also has a 10% buffer pool and the record says no reversal events were reported, but the reversal history is not fully consistent across documents. Leakage is described as deemed negligible, yet another document indicates it was quantified, so I treat the leakage treatment as somewhat uncertain. The baseline is project-based and the last reassessment date is not stated in available documents, which weakens robustness.

### Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The issuance record identifies the VVB, monitoring period, methodology, and crediting period, which helps traceability.

- Key MRV fields such as total issued versus verified ERs, usage monitoring, and leakage quantification are not stated in the extracted record.

The issuance record names AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U., gives the monitoring period from 2016-04-13 to 2021-12-31, and identifies the methodology and crediting period, which supports traceability. However, total ERs claimed versus verified are not found in the extracted record, and the usage monitoring method is not stated. The record also does not provide a leakage deduction percentage or other detailed MRV figures, limiting public verifiability.

### Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline under an established VCS methodology and reports no reversal events in the issuance record.

- Leakage justification is only described as negligible, and the contradiction with a quantified treatment raises over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is helped by the VCS framework, VVB-confirmed additionality, and the absence of reported reversal events in the issuance record. That said, the project relies on a project baseline rather than a more conservative jurisdictional baseline, and leakage is only described as negligible without a quantified deduction in the extracted facts. The contradiction between a negligible leakage statement and a separate quantified treatment increases over-crediting risk.

### Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ Twelve documents were used, the extraction confidence is medium, and the issuance record reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- The evidence set is incomplete on several operational details, including usage monitoring, verified usage rates, and baseline reassessment timing.

Documentation quality is moderate: twelve documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium, but one key document was not fully readable enough to avoid gaps. The issuance record reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is positive. Even so, several important fields are missing, including verified issuance totals, usage monitoring details, and baseline reassessment timing, so the record is not fully complete.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● <b>Permanence</b>	buffer pool present, no reversal-free assurance
● <b>Leakage</b>	leakage treated as negligible but contradictory
● <b>Baseline</b>	project baseline, reassessment timing missing
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified versus claimed ER totals, leakage calculation, and usage monitoring method in a single reconciled MRV summary.

→ Resolve the contradictions on leakage and reversal treatment with a document trail showing which source is authoritative and why.

## Documents Reviewed

- 2471\_VCS\_RV1\_PRR\_26JUL2023.pdf
- VCS-Issuance-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1\_Indonesia (1) (2).pdf
- Uganda-VCS-Monitoring-Report-vf\_V0.4\_Clean.pdf
- Uganda\_GPS\_Tracks\_Polygone\_2016\_2019\_v2.kml
- VCS-Listing-Representation-Single-Representor-PUR Uganda.pdf
- Uganda-VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-vf\_V0.2\_sent\_20220415 (6).pdf
- VCS-Registration-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1.pdf
- 2471 Extension.pdf
- Uganda-VCS-Project-Description-vf\_V07\_clean.pdf
- Uganda-VCS-Project-Description-v0.5-VD.docx (2).pdf
- Val-Ver report PUR Uganda v4 clean version.pdf
- Validation representation.pdf
- Verification representation.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-86DA7210 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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