

## QUALITY REPORT

# REGENERATING DEGRADED LANDS IN FLORIDA THROUGH PONGAMIA

VCS-3019 · VCS · United States

Report ID: CM-ABEDBB8E · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**3.8**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>4.2</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>3.6</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>3.8</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>3.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signs, including VVB-verified additionality and a long monitoring record, but the documentation shows major gaps around leakage, permanence, and supporting files. The verification report also records a very large number of CARs/ADRs/CRs and a low extraction confidence, which weakens trust in the reported claims.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3019
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	United States
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AR-AMS0007 3.1
Crediting Period	2018 — 2038
VVB	TÜV SÜD (formerly Ruby Canyon Environmental)
Verified ERs	4,643 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the latest extracted record, despite an earlier document saying it was negligible.
- The verification report lists 69 corrective action requests, 29 additional documentation requests, and 40 clarification requests, indicating substantial documentation weaknesses.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by TÜV SÜD, and the project used a barrier test under the VCS methodology.

- Leakage is not addressed in the latest verification record, and there is no quantified deduction or clear justification in the extracted facts.

The verification report from TÜV SÜD confirms additionality through a barrier test, which supports the project's core crediting logic. However, the latest extracted record says leakage is not addressed, while an earlier document reportedly treated it as negligible; that inconsistency weakens confidence in the emissions accounting. The project also claims an exemption from the AFOLU non-permanence risk tool and 40-year longevity requirements, but the extracted facts do not show a buffer pool or a clear reversal-risk treatment beyond that exemption.

### Transparency — 3.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period runs from 2018-08-20 to 2024-01-09, and the verification report provides a verified emissions reduction total of 4,643.

- Key public-facing MRV details are missing, including the monitoring method for usage, and the extraction confidence is low.

The monitoring period is clearly stated and the verification report reports 4,643 verified emission reductions, which helps traceability. Even so, the record lacks key MRV details such as the usage monitoring method, and total claimed reductions are not available for comparison. The low extraction confidence further reduces transparency because at least one key document was poorly readable.

### Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

+ The project is not shown to have double-issuance evidence, and the registry status is clearly identified as VCS registered.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized or recently reassessed, and leakage treatment is unresolved in the latest record.

Claim safety is weakened by the unresolved leakage treatment and the use of a project-specific baseline rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed baseline. The project is VCS registered, but CCP status and CORSIA eligibility are not stated, so there is no strong evidence that dual-market claim risk is excluded. The contradiction on leakage is especially important because the latest record says it is not addressed, while an earlier document said it was negligible; I privileged the later verification report because it is more recent and should reflect the final audited position.

### Documentation — 3.1 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including a verification report dated 2026-01-07, and safeguards were at least partially documented.

- The extraction confidence is low, one key file was not readable enough to recover all details, and the verification report required many corrective actions.

Documentation quality is only moderate because the project has a verification report, a defined monitoring window, and multiple extracted documents, but the record also shows low extraction confidence. The verification report lists 69 corrective action requests, 29 additional documentation requests, and 40 clarification requests, which suggests substantial gaps in the underlying file set. Safeguards are present in part, with FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and stakeholder communication mentioned, but the supporting detail is incomplete.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● <b>Permanence</b>	exemption claimed, buffer not stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	latest record leaves leakage unresolved
● <b>Baseline</b>	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance process present, details incomplete
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the missing project-area KML, full grievance-counsel description, and updated PD/MR sections requested by the VVB.

→ Publish a clear leakage assessment, permanence treatment, and complete MRV package with readable supporting documents and reconciled crediting-period dates.

## Documents Reviewed

- VCS\_R\_V\_PRR\_3019\_7 January 2026.pdf
- CURREN~1.PDF
- FRPF1\_Listing\_Rep.pdf
- VCS\_NPR\_REP\_3019\_8\_20\_2018\_8\_19\_2038 (1).pdf
- VCS\_RV\_EXEMPTION-APPROVED\_3019\_01AUG2024\_ADJUSTED.pdf
- Annex 2. Soils map for the Project Area.pdf
- Partial-Release-Listing-Representation-v4.2.pdf
- Registration Representation\_08Sept2025.pdf
- Project Area 510 ha.kml
- Annex 3. GHG Monitoring Report (20\_Aug\_2018-09\_Jan\_2024).xlsx
- Verra-Registry-Communications-Agreement\_19 April 2024.pdf
- PROJ\_DESC\_DRAFT\_3019\_25MAY2022.pdf
- Validation-Representation-3019.pdf
- VCSVAL~1.PDF
- Verification-Representation-3019.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-ABEDBB8E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)