

## QUALITY REPORT

# ACAP Albania Vjosë-Nartë A/R project

VCS-2547 · VCS · Albania

Report ID: CM-F52A2BA5 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 4.9

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
■ Documentation (15%)	3.4

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage treatment, and a 10% buffer pool. However, the record is thin on monitoring and verification detail, and the low extraction confidence plus document contradictions reduce confidence in the claims. Overall, this looks like a moderately credible VCS project, but not one with strong evidence quality or low claim risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2547
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Albania
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0003 02.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2041
VVB	AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- Key monitoring and verification fields are not stated in the extracted record, including the monitoring period and verified issuance figures.
- The documents conflict on additionality, test type, leakage rationale, and reversal treatment, which weakens reliability.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the PDD describes an investment-based additionality test.

+ Leakage is treated with a quantified deduction of 0%, and the project sets aside a 10% buffer pool with no reversal events reported.

The PDD states that additionality was verified by the VVB and that the project used an investment test, which supports the integrity case. Leakage is addressed with a quantified deduction of 0%, and the project includes a 10% buffer pool with no reversal events reported. That said, the baseline is project-based and the record does not show a baseline reassessment date, so the overall integrity case is solid but not especially strong.

### Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The project is registered under VCS and the PDD identifies the verifier as AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U.

- The monitoring period, verified and claimed ERR totals, and usage monitoring method are not stated in the extracted record, limiting public MRV transparency.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record does not state the monitoring period, the total claimed or verified emission reductions, or the usage monitoring method. The project is registered under VCS and the verifier is named as AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U., which helps, but the MRV trail is incomplete in the available documents. Because extraction confidence is low, the documentation quality also constrains transparency.

### Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ A quantified leakage treatment and buffer pool reduce over-crediting and permanence risk somewhat.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional or standardized, and CORSIA eligibility is not stated, leaving claim-safety uncertainty.

Claim safety is moderate rather than strong. The quantified leakage treatment and buffer pool help, but the baseline remains project-specific and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status. The contradictions around additionality, leakage justification, and test type also raise some over-crediting and claim-reliability concerns.

### Documentation — 3.4 / 10

+ The record includes a PDD, a named VVB, a crediting period, and several safeguard indicators such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism.

- Extraction confidence is low and only one document is clearly identified, while several core fields are missing or not stated.

The available record includes a PDD, a long crediting period, and safeguard references such as FPIC, benefit sharing, and a grievance mechanism. However, the extraction confidence is low, only one document is clearly identified in the evidence list, and several key fields are missing or not stated. That combination points to a documentation set that is usable but incomplete.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	buffer pool present, no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	quantified leakage treatment
● <b>Baseline</b>	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete monitoring report with the monitoring period, verified issuance totals, and the usage monitoring method.

→ Resolve the document contradictions by providing a clear audit trail showing which additionality and leakage statements are authoritative and why.

## Documents Reviewed

- Project\_areas\_KML.kml
- 4a. ACAP - Risk Report Calculation Tool.xls
- 6.ACAP - Listing Representation Single Representor.pdf
- COMMS\_AGREE\_ACAP\_02Jul2021.pdf
- PP\_REG\_REP\_ACAP\_04Apr2021.pdf
- Non-permanence risk report
- PROJ\_DESC\_ACAP\_21Sep2022.pdf
- 2. ACAP - Project Design Document\_revCS-210823.pdf
- VAL\_REP\_ACAP\_21Sep2022.pdf
- VALID\_STA\_ACAP\_01Apr2022.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-F52A2BA5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy