

QUALITY REPORT

Agoro Carbon USA Cropland Program

VCS-3634 · VCS · United States

Report ID: CM-7C117921 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some important strengths (VVB verification of additionality, a 22% buffer pool, and a recent validation report clarifying leakage). However, contradictions across documents, two corrective action requests, and several missing quantified fields (verified ERR, leakage deduction percent, usage monitoring) reduce confidence and increase risk of overclaiming.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3634
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	United States
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	VM0042 2.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2042
VVB	SCS Global Services
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2041
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Contradictory statements between PDD, monitoring report, and validation report on leakage, FPIC, grievance mechanism, safeguards, benefit sharing, and crediting period
- Reversal treatment listed as 'not addressed' in extracted record and two corrective action requests issued

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.5 / 10

- + Additionality confirmed by the VVB (SCS Global Services) per the monitoring/validation materials
- Reversal treatment not addressed in the extracted record and two corrective actions outstanding, lowering permanence confidence

Additionality is supported by a barrier test and was confirmed by the VVB (SCS Global Services) in project documentation, which is a positive. The project uses a project-specific baseline (VM0042 methodology v2.0) and there is no record of a recent baseline reassessment, reducing baseline robustness. A 22% buffer pool is in place, which helps permanence, but the extracted facts state reversal events are 'not addressed' and two corrective action requests were issued, undermining permanence confidence. Overall these mixed signals yield a moderate integrity score.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

- + VVB named (SCS Global Services) and monitoring/validation documents present with recent dates (monitoring report 2025-05-21, validation report 2025-11-10)
- Key quantified fields missing or unverified: total verified emission reductions not provided, leakage deduction percent not in the monitoring record

The VVB is identified and both a monitoring report (2025-05-21) and a validation report (2025-11-10) are in the record, which supports transparency. However, the monitoring record lacks the verified ERR total and does not state a leakage deduction percent; usage monitoring method and verified usage rates are also absent. Extraction confidence is high, so missing fields reflect genuine documentation gaps rather than extraction error.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + Project is not CORSIA-eligible, reducing double-claim risk from that channel
- Leakage justification is reported as quantified in the validation report (2025-11-10) but the PDD did not address leakage — contradiction creates uncertainty

The project is not CORSIA-eligible, lowering double-claim risk via that channel. The validation report indicates leakage was quantified, which is positive for claim safety, but the PDD earlier did not address leakage and several monitoring fields (usage monitoring, verified ERR) are missing. These contradictions and gaps increase the risk of overcrediting or weak claims.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Multiple documents available (PDD, monitoring report, validation report) and extraction confidence is high
- Two corrective action requests and multiple contradictions between documents indicate reliability issues in the record

There are multiple evidence documents listed (PDD, monitoring report, validation report) and 20 documents used with high extraction confidence, and the monitoring report is recent (2025-05-21) with a later validation (2025-11-10). Nonetheless, two corrective action requests were issued and several contradictions exist between documents, indicating the documentation package is imperfect and still under resolution.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	buffered but reversals unclear
● Leakage	quantified but inconsistent docs
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment unclear
● Safeguards	partially documented; contradictory
● Double-claim	CORSIA no, CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled document or amendment that resolves contradictions (leakage, FPIC, grievance, safeguards, benefit sharing, crediting period) and references the authoritative dates

→ Provide verified totals and missing quantified fields in the monitoring/verification package (verified ERR, leakage deduction percent, usage monitoring method and verified usage rates) and close corrective actions

Documents Reviewed

- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- SD VISta Draft Monitoring Report
- row_crop_boundary_v5.kml
- Registration Review Report
- Registration Representation
- Non-permanence risk report
- st_us.kml
- SD VISta Registration Representation
- SD VISta Listing Representation
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Listing Representation
- SD VISta Project Description
- SD VISta Draft Project Description
- SD VISta Validation Representation
- SD VISta Validation Report
- Validation Report

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-7C117921 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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