QUALITY REPORT

REDD+ THE LAST HABITAT

VCS-3344 · VCS · Peru

Report ID: CM-F641CAB5 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.8 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	3.6
	Transparency (25%)	1.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.1
	Documentation (15%)	2.4

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive elements, including a VVB-confirmed investment test, a quantified leakage deduction of 0%, and a 14% buffer contribution. However, the record also shows reported reversal events, a project-specific baseline, and major documentation problems flagged by Verra, which materially weaken confidence in the crediting claims.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3344
Sector	redd
Country	Peru
Vintage	2025
Project Methodology	VMD0015 Version 1.6
Crediting Period	2020 — 2039
VVB	AENOR CONFIA, S.A.U
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- ■ Reported reversal and land-use conflict events in the project area, including deforestation, usurpation, and armed intrusion.
- ■ Verra found the project documentation incomplete and identified multiple unresolved CCB/VCS compliance issues.
- ■ Contradictions in the extracted record affect buffer size, leakage treatment, FPIC, and CCP status.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.6 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which is stronger than an unverified claim.

- Reversal events were reported, and the project relies on a 14% buffer contribution rather than a reversal-free record.

The project has some integrity support because the VVB confirmed additionality through an investment test, and the baseline was last reassessed in 2021. However, reversal events are reported in the extracted record, including deforestation, usurpation, and armed intrusion, which raises permanence concerns even with a 14% buffer contribution. Leakage is treated with a quantified 0% deduction, but the contradiction showing an alternative record that said leakage was not addressed reduces confidence in the treatment.

Transparency — 1.8 / 10

- The monitoring period is stated, but the record does not provide verified issuance totals or usage monitoring details.
- Verra said the documentation was incomplete and that the VVB had not fully described its assessment of VCS conformance.

Transparency is weak because the record does not state verified issuance totals, and usage monitoring details are not found in the available documents. The monitoring period is identified, but the project documentation was also found by Verra to be incomplete, and the VVB was said not to have fully described its assessment of VCS conformance. The extraction confidence is medium rather than high, which further limits trust in the completeness of the public record.

Claim Safety — 3.1 / 10

+ Leakage was treated with a quantified deduction of 0%, which is better than no treatment at all.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and the record contains contradictions on leakage and CCP status.

Claim safety is limited by the project-specific baseline and the absence of clear verified usage data. The quantified leakage deduction of 0% helps, but the contradiction indicating leakage may have been not addressed in another document weakens confidence. The record also does not clearly state CORSIA eligibility, while a contradiction suggests CCP approval may have been claimed elsewhere, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out cleanly.

Documentation — 2.4 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including a stakeholder consultation record dated 2024-10-11 and a named VVB.

- Verra explicitly stated the project documentation is incomplete, and the extraction confidence is only medium.

Documentation quality is poor to moderate: there is a named VVB, a stated monitoring period, and several official findings, but Verra explicitly said the documentation is incomplete and non-conforming. The record also includes multiple unresolved corrective actions, and the evidence list is sparse. Because one key document was only extracted with medium confidence, the documentation score is further constrained.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	mixed evidence / unresolved risk
Permanence	mixed evidence / unresolved risk
Leakage	mixed evidence / unresolved risk
Baseline	mixed evidence / unresolved risk
Safeguards	mixed evidence / unresolved risk
Double-claim	mixed evidence / unresolved risk

Documents Reviewed

- 20230503_CCB_VCS_MR_THE_LAST_HABITAT.pdf
- 20230317_CCB_VCS_MR_THE_LAST_HABITAT_RESUMEN_ESP.pdf
- 20240827_CCB_VCS_MR_THE_LAST_HABITAT_RESUMEN_ESP.pdf
- 26032024_CCB_VCS_MR_THE_LAST_HABITAT_v4.pdf
- CCB_ VCS_V_R_REQUEST_DENIED_Project 3344_23AUG2024.pdf
- VCS_NPRT_EXEMPTION-APPROVED_3344_01MAR2024.pdf
- 20220704_THELASTHABITAT_PDSUMMARY_ESPANOL.pdf
- 202400827_THELASTHABITAT_PDSUMMARY_ESP_VF.pdf
- THELASTHABITAT_Ex.request_VERRA.pdf
- Public_Comments_Summary_Project 3344.pdf
- 20220625_PD_THELASTHABITAT.pdf
- 26032024_PD_THELASTHABITAT_v5.pdf

Report ID: CM-F641CAB5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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