

QUALITY REPORT

Bull Run Overseas Forest Carbon Project

VCS-812 · VCS · Belize

Report ID: CM-D31092DE · Generated: 2026-04-21 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	2.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	2.6

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

Assessment Summary

This project shows some formal structure, including VVB verification of additionality and a buffer pool, but the record contains major reliability and permanence concerns. Reported reversals, a project-based baseline, zero leakage deduction despite contradictory leakage treatment, and multiple material findings all weaken confidence in the credited climate benefit.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-812
Sector	redd
Country	Belize
Vintage	2009
Project Methodology	VM0007 1.1
Crediting Period	2009 — 2038
VVB	Environmental Services Incorporated
Verified ERs	316,958 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2010
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-21

Red Flags

- Reversal events were reported, including illegal forest management and unexpected disturbances, which raises permanence risk.
- The documents contain major contradictions on leakage, additionality, FPIC, and claimed emissions reductions, reducing reliability.
- The project is not CORSIA-eligible, yet CCP status is approved, which still leaves claim-framing and double-claiming concerns to resolve.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and a 23% buffer pool was set aside.
- The issuance record reports reversal events and multiple material findings, including leakage and additionality concerns.

The record supports some integrity elements: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and a 23% buffer pool was established. However, the issuance material reports reversal events tied to illegal forest management and unexpected disturbances, and it also lists material findings about leakage, carbon stock methodology, and carbon rights. The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and the project-based leakage treatment is not cleanly resolved.

Transparency — 2.4 / 10

- + The monitoring period and verified emissions reductions are stated, and the VVB is named as Environmental Services Incorporated.
- Monitoring detail is thin in places, with no usage monitoring method stated and low extraction confidence from the source record.

Transparency is limited by incomplete monitoring detail and low extraction confidence. The monitoring period is stated, the VVB is named, and verified emissions reductions are reported, but the usage monitoring method is not stated and the extracted record does not clearly identify all source documents. The documentation also shows gaps in how calculations and monitoring frequencies were described.

Claim Safety — 2.2 / 10

- + The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of claim risk.
- The baseline is project-specific, leakage treatment is disputed across documents, and the claimed versus verified emissions reductions differ across records.

Claim safety is weak because the project relies on a project-specific baseline and the leakage story is inconsistent across documents. The extracted facts show a zero leakage deduction, but the contradictions also reference a much larger leakage deduction and a separate finding that leakage would negate hardwood forest benefits. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which helps, but the approved CCP status does not offset the over-crediting and leakage uncertainty.

Documentation — 2.6 / 10

- + Multiple official document types appear to have been used, including issuance material with corrective actions and material findings.
- Extraction confidence is low, evidence documents are not clearly identified, and several key items are missing or only partially specified.

Documentation quality is poor to moderate at best. The record includes issuance material, corrective actions, and a named verifier, but the extraction confidence is low and several key fields are missing or not stated, including baseline reassessment timing and usage monitoring detail. The long list of material findings suggests the underlying documentation was incomplete or inconsistent at the time of issuance.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed but contradictory
● Permanence	reversal events reported
● Leakage	leakage treatment disputed
● Baseline	project baseline only
● Safeguards	safeguards mentioned, FPIC absent
● Double-claim	CCP approved but not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled, document-by-document explanation for the contradictions on leakage, additionality, FPIC, and emissions reductions.

→ Publish a complete monitoring package with clear leakage calculations, usage monitoring, baseline reassessment history, and evidence of carbon rights and permanence safeguards.

Documents Reviewed

- PP_ISS_REP_812_01JAN2009_31DEC2010.pdf
- CCB_MON_PLA_ENG_812_26MAR2013.pdf
- MONIT_REP_812_01JAN2009_31DEC2010.pdf
- CCB_PUB_COM_812_24JAN2012.pdf
- KML_812.kml
- AFOLU_PROJ_ELEM_812_14MAR2012.pdf
- ACC_REP_812_23MAY2013.pdf
- BRO VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report Template v3.0_0 2009-2010 ver 2.pdf
- BRO VCS Non-Permanence Risk Report Template, v3.0_0 2009-2010 ver 2.1.pdf
- PP_REG_REP_812_31MAR2012.pdf
- 20120402_acl_vcs_registration_representation.pdf
- CCB_PROJ_DESC_ENG_812_24JAN2012.pdf
- PROJ_DESC_812_14MAR2012.pdf
- BRO_VCS_PDD_Phase_I_Version_1-6_Final.pdf
- CCB_VALID_REP_ENG_812_15MAR2012.pdf
- CCB_VALID_STA_812_15MAR2012.pdf
- 048-Bull_Run_Validation_Report-Final.pdf
- 048-Bull_Run_VCS_Validation_Representation.pdf
- VERIF_STA_812_01JAN2009_31DEC2010.pdf
- VERIF_REP_812_01JAN2009_31DEC2010.pdf
- VALID_STA_812_15MAR2012.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-D31092DE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-21 · Generated: 2026-04-21

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