QUALITY REPORT

Chestnut Carbon Conservation Project

VCS-3814 · VCS · United States

Report ID: CM-3F354139 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	6.1
Transparency (25%)	6.4
Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS AFOLU soil carbon project shows some core integrity elements (VVB-confirmed additionality, buffer pool contribution, and no reported reversals in the monitoring report). However, key risk controls are weakened by inconsistencies between the PDD and monitoring report—especially around leakage treatment and the additionality test type—creating over-crediting and reliability concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3814
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	United States
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	VM0003 1.3
Crediting Period	2022 — 2047
VVB	AENOR
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the PDD indicates leakage was quantified, but the monitoring report says leakage was not addressed.

■ Additionality test type conflicts between documents (investment test in the PDD vs common practice in the monitoring report), reducing confidence in the additionality narrative.

■ Crediting period dates differ between the PDD and monitoring report, indicating basic project metadata inconsistency.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2023) reports no reversal events and shows a 15% buffer pool contribution.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report (2023) and the leakage deduction is not found in the extracted record, despite the PDD (2022) indicating leakage was quantified.

The monitoring report (2023) indicates no reversal events and shows a 15% buffer pool contribution, which supports permanence management for an AFOLU project. Additionality is stated as confirmed by the VVB, with the monitoring report (2023) describing a common practice test. Integrity is weakened because leakage is shown as not addressed in the monitoring report (2023) and the leakage deduction is not found in the extracted record, while the PDD (2022) indicates leakage was quantified—this inconsistency raises over-crediting risk.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

+ The VVB is identified as AENOR and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2022-07-05 to 2023-01-31) in the monitoring report (2023).

- Verified and claimed ER totals are not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to reconcile issuance with monitoring.

The monitoring report (2023) clearly states the monitoring period (2022-07-05 to 2023-01-31) and identifies the VVB as AENOR, which supports traceability. Safeguards elements (FPIC and a grievance mechanism) are indicated in the extracted record, suggesting some non-carbon transparency. However, the total emissions reductions/removals claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record, limiting independent reconciliation of monitoring results to issuance.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ A buffer pool contribution of 15% (monitoring report, 2023) reduces non-permanence risk relative to having no buffer.

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, and leakage handling is inconsistent across documents, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is moderated by uncertainty around eligibility and market claims: CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents. The baseline is project-specific (as indicated in the extracted record), which generally carries higher over-crediting risk than standardized/jurisdictional baselines unless well-justified and frequently reassessed (reassessment timing is not found). The leakage inconsistency between the PDD (2022) and monitoring report (2023) further increases the risk that credited removals could be overstated.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and extraction confidence is high.

- Contradictions across documents on key fields (additionality test type, leakage justification, crediting period, reversals) indicate documentation quality/control issues.

The evidence set includes key document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and the extraction confidence is high, supporting a solid documentation score. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is a positive signal for audit outcomes. Nonetheless, multiple internal inconsistencies across documents on fundamental fields (additionality test type, leakage justification, crediting period, and reversal reporting) indicate document control issues that reduce reliability.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed, but test type inconsistent across documents
Permanence	Buffer pool (15%) and no reversals reported
Leakage	Leakage not addressed in monitoring; inconsistent with PDD
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear leakage section in the monitoring/verification package that reconciles the PDD's quantified leakage approach with the monitoring report, including the applied leakage deduction (if any) and justification.

→ Provide a transparent ER reconciliation table linking monitored results to issuance (claimed vs verified totals, vintage, and any deductions), and correct inconsistent project metadata (crediting period dates and additionality test description) across documents.

Documents Reviewed

- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Non-permanence risk report
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-3F354139 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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