

## QUALITY REPORT

# XiCO2e: Mexican Reforestation Project

VCS-3342 · VCS · Mexico

Report ID: CM-305AA6AB · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 5.1

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.0
■ Transparency (25%)	4.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

## Assessment Summary

The project shows several positive integrity features (VVB-confirmed additionality, 15% buffer allocation, quantified leakage in the latest verification), but document contradictions, multiple findings during verification, and low extraction confidence reduce overall reliability. Documentation and transparency are moderate but would benefit from clearer, consistent public documentation.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3342
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Mexico
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0003 V2.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2047
VVB	AENOR International S.A.U.
Verified ERs	84,598 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2022
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

## Red Flags

- Contradictory entries across documents on leakage justification and additionality test type
- Low extraction confidence and 'evidence\_docs' not specified
- Reversal treatment is inconsistently reported ('not\_addressed' vs 'none\_reported')

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.0 / 10

+ VVB confirmed additionality and a combined additionality test reported in the verification report (verification report, 2025-02-14)

- 23 findings (11 CLs, 12 CARs) were recorded during validation/verification, indicating issues that required corrective actions (verification report, 2025-02-14)

The verification report dated 2025-02-14 confirms additionality using a combined test and a VVB (AENOR), and the project applied a 15% buffer allocation using the VCS AFOLU Non-Permanence Risk Tool v4.0 (verification report, 2025-02-14). The baseline is project-specific (method AR-ACM0003), which is acceptable but less robust than a recent jurisdictional baseline. Material findings (23 total, including 12 CARs) were raised and stated as closed, which shows corrective action but indicates initial shortcomings in implementation or documentation.

### Transparency — 4.5 / 10

+ Monitoring period (2017-11-01 — 2022-07-30) and verified issuance vs claimed ERR are provided (total ERR claimed 95,701; total verified 84,598) (verification report, 2025-02-14)

- Key supporting docs are listed as 'unknown' and extraction confidence is low, and evidence documents are not publicly identified

The monitoring period and both claimed and verified removals are reported (monitoring period 2017-11-01 — 2022-07-30; claimed 95,701 tCO<sub>2</sub>e; verified 84,598 tCO<sub>2</sub>e), supporting traceability (verification report, 2025-02-14). However, evidence documents are not named (listed as 'unknown') and the extraction confidence is low, reducing the ability of third parties to verify the record independently.

### Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ A 15% buffer allocation was applied, and leakage is reported as quantified in the latest verification (verification report, 2025-02-14)

- Contradictory records on leakage (quantified vs deemed negligible) and additionality test type increase risk of over-claiming or inconsistent accounting

A buffer pool of 15% and a quantified leakage justification in the latest verification reduce clear over-crediting risk; verified issuance (84,598 VCUs) appears conservative relative to claimed removals. Contradictions in leakage treatment (quantified vs deemed negligible) and in the type of additionality test introduce uncertainty about consistent application of conservative assumptions and could mask over- or under-crediting.

### Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ Twelve documents were used and a recent verification report date is present (doc\_date 2025-02-14)

- Minimum extraction confidence is low and evidence document identifiers are not provided, reducing reproducibility

Twelve documents were used and a recent verification report exists (2025-02-14), but minimum extraction confidence is low and evidence documents are not explicitly identified. The project shows a long crediting period stated in documents, but there are conflicting crediting-period entries across records. Corrective actions were required and reportedly closed, which supports procedural completeness but highlights prior deficiencies.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed
● <b>Permanence</b>	buffer applied; reversal unclear
● <b>Leakage</b>	quantified but contradictory
● <b>Baseline</b>	project baseline
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status unknown

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish and link the specific evidence documents (monitoring and verification reports, PDD) so third parties can review assumptions and calculations

→ Resolve contradictions across documents (explicitly reconcile leakage treatment, additionality test type, reversal treatment, and crediting period) and reissue a harmonized statement in the registry

## Documents Reviewed

- VCS\_RV\_R2\_PRR\_3342\_14FEB2025.pdf
- Issuance-Representation-Multiple-PPs-v4.2-1\_Forliance\_Ala Bool\_vs1.pdf
- 20250502\_Proxylo\_VCS-Joint-PD-MR\_vs12\_clean.pdf
- Project Location.kml
- Ex ante GHG\_LTA\_assessment\_04\_24\_vs8.xlsx
- Project\_area\_xico2e\_mexican\_reforestation\_project\_ID3342.kml
- 20240424\_Non-Permanence-Risk-Report-XiCO2\_vs7\_clean.pdf
- Registration-Representation-Multiple-PPs-v4.2 (1)\_Forliance\_Ala bool[38]\_signed\_vs1.pdf
- Ex post GHG\_assessment\_04\_24\_vs8.xlsx
- VCS-Project-Description-XiCO2e Mexican Reforestation-v4.1.pdf
- VCS-Listing-Representation-Multiple-Representors-v4.1.pdf
- 06022025-vcs-joint-validation-and-verification-template-v4.2\_XICO2.v4.1\_clean.pdf
- Verra-Registry-Communications-Agreement-single-PP.pdf
- Verification-Representation-v4.2\_XICO2.pdf
- Validation-Representation-v4.2\_XICO2.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-305AA6AB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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