QUALITY REPORT

Afforestation of degraded grasslands in Caazapa and Guairá

VCS-2498 · VCS · Paraguay

Report ID: CM-EE76AC85 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.8
Transparency (25%)	4.6
Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
Documentation (15%)	3.8

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS afforestation project with some strong safeguards and a VVB-confirmed additionality assessment, but the evidence base is thin and partly inconsistent. The main concerns are the reported reversal/non-permanence issue, missing leakage quantification, and low extraction confidence, which together limit confidence in the crediting claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2498
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Paraguay
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0003 2.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2045
VVB	AENOR
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2020
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- ■ A reversal/non-permanence issue is reported, and the record says the risk rating was corrected from 16% to 14%, which raises permanence concerns.
- ■ Leakage is described as negligible, but no quantified leakage deduction is provided in the extracted record.
- ■ The extracted documents contain contradictions on the additionality test type and on whether reversals were reported.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under the AR-ACM0003 methodology.

- Reversal events are reported, and the non-permanence risk rating was corrected from 16% to 14%, which weakens permanence confidence.

The verification report from AENOR confirms additionality, and the project uses a combined additionality test under AR-ACM0003, which supports the baseline and additionality case. However, the record also says reversal events were reported and that the non-permanence risk rating was corrected from 16% to 14%, which is a meaningful permanence concern. Leakage is only described as negligible, with no quantified deduction in the extracted facts, so the integrity case is moderate rather than strong.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the verification report identifies AENOR as the VVB.

- Key MRV details are missing from the extracted record, including verified issuance totals, leakage deduction, and usage monitoring method.

The monitoring period and VVB identity are stated clearly in the verification report, which helps traceability. At the same time, the extracted record does not provide verified issuance totals, leakage deduction, or usage monitoring method, so the MRV picture is incomplete. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the available documentation fully captures the project record.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is in the AFOLU sector with a stated project baseline and a leakage justification that leakage is deemed negligible.

- No quantified leakage deduction, no CORSIA eligibility status, and no CCP status are stated, leaving residual over-crediting and claim-risk uncertainty.

The project has a stated project baseline and a methodology appropriate for afforestation, and the leakage justification says leakage is deemed negligible. But the absence of a quantified leakage deduction, together with missing CORSIA and CCP status, leaves uncertainty around claim safety and over-crediting risk. The reported reversal issue also weakens confidence that credits are fully durable and conservatively accounted for.

Documentation — 3.8 / 10

+ The record includes a verification report date, a monitoring period, and 11 documents used in extraction.

- Extraction confidence is low, and the evidence list is effectively non-specific, with no corrective actions or material findings to anchor the review.

The record includes a verification report date, a monitoring period, and 11 documents used, which is better than a minimal file. Still, the extraction confidence is low, and the evidence list is not specific, so the documentation base appears fragile. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, but that does not offset the missing detail and the limited readability of at least one key document.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed test
Permanence	reversal events reported
Leakage	negligible but unquantified
Baseline	project baseline stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a quantified leakage assessment and any deduction applied in the issuance calculation.

→ Publish the full verification and monitoring evidence for the reversal issue, including how the corrected non-permanence risk rating was derived and whether any credits were withheld or adjusted.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance representation_c2.pdf
- 211203_VCS_Projec Description_AR Miller_English_V4_clean.pdf
- 4. Project area.kml
- 2498 Caazapa Extension Request 19 Jun 2021.pdf
- 2. VERRA_Communications Agreement_ Miller Forest (1).pdf
- 2498_Caazapa PRR final.pdf
- Registration-Representation.pdf
- 1. VCS Listing representation_Miller Forest - VERRA (1).pdf
- 5_PDMR.pdf
- Caazapa VCS-Validation-Representation-v4.1.pdf
- 4. Caazapa val-ver VR 050821 V3 clean.pdf
- Caazapa VCS-Verification-Representation-v4.1.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-EE76AC85 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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