


QUALITY REPORT

CIKEL BRAZILIAN AMAZON REDD PROJECT AVOIDING PLANNED DEFORESTATION

VCS-832 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-4D00E14B · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS REDD+ avoided planned deforestation project using VM0007 with VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated buffer contribution, and no material findings or corrective actions reported in the extracted record. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (buffer percentage, reversals, safeguards, and verified ERs) reduce confidence in the reliability of key risk and volume figures. Overall quality appears moderate, with elevated over-crediting and claims-risk driven by contradictions and missing leakage and baseline reassessment details.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-832
Sector	redd
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2007
Project Methodology	VM0007 1.0
Crediting Period	2007 — 2027
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	4,094,462 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2007 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	23 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Conflicting buffer pool contribution values (15.5% in a monitoring report vs 10% in a validation report) undermine permanence-risk clarity.
- Reversal status is inconsistent across documents (none reported vs reported), creating uncertainty about non-permanence outcomes and buffer adequacy.
- Verified emission reductions are inconsistent for the same date (4,094,462 vs 3,284,853), increasing over-crediting/claims risk.
- Leakage is said to be quantified but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ The monitoring documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, and no material findings or corrective actions are listed.

- Permanence and volume integrity are weakened by contradictions on buffer contribution and reversal occurrence, and the baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record.

The monitoring documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, and the extracted record lists no material findings or corrective actions. A buffer contribution is reported (15.5%), and reversals are described as none reported with eligibility for buffer release, but both buffer percentage and reversal occurrence are contradicted elsewhere. Leakage is described as quantified, yet the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, and the baseline is project-specific with no stated reassessment date, which weakens baseline robustness.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

+ The project identifies the VVB (Earthood Services Private Limited) and provides a clear monitoring period (2007-07-19 to 2017-07-18) with a quantified verified ER figure reported in the extracted record.

- Key MRV/registry clarity gaps remain because the claimed ER total is not found in the extracted record and the verified ER total is contradictory across documents.

The extracted record provides the VVB name (Earthood Services Private Limited) and a defined monitoring period (2007-07-19 to 2017-07-18), supporting basic traceability. However, the total claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record, and the verified ER total is inconsistent across documents, reducing MRV clarity. Several operational monitoring fields (such as usage monitoring) are not applicable or not found, which is acceptable for REDD+ in parts but still leaves gaps for readers trying to reconcile volumes.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ A buffer contribution is reported and reversals are described as eligible for buffer release in the monitoring documentation, which can support conservative claims when consistently documented.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and contradictions in verified ERs and reversal reporting elevate greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Because the baseline is project-specific and the baseline reassessment timing is not stated in the extracted record, there is residual over-crediting risk typical of APD projects if baseline assumptions drift over time. The project's CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess cross-eligibility and claims constraints. Contradictory verified ER totals and reversal reporting increase the risk that public claims could be challenged or misinterpreted.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (18) including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance, and extraction confidence is high.

- Several critical fields are missing or inconsistent across documents (leakage deduction percent, baseline reassessment date, safeguards/FPIC/grievance consistency), reducing documentation reliability.

The evidence set is relatively complete in type (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 18 documents used and high extraction confidence, which supports a solid documentation score. Nonetheless, multiple key facts conflict across documents (buffer percentage, reversals, safeguards/FPIC/grievance, crediting period, and verified ER totals), indicating record-management or version-control issues. Missing quantified items (like leakage deduction percent and baseline reassessment date) further reduce completeness for quality assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Buffer present but reversal reporting inconsistent
● Leakage	Quantified in narrative but % not evidenced
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing reported but contradicted
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation table across versions showing buffer pool contribution, any reversals (if any), and the exact verified ER totals by monitoring period with registry issuance references.

→ Disclose the quantified leakage deduction percentage and the baseline reassessment approach/date (or confirm none required under VM0007 for the period) in a single, current monitoring/verification summary.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- AFOLU Project Element
- Non-permanence risk report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Project Description
- Validation / Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation

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-4D00E14B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy