QUALITY REPORT

A Bearadise

VCS-872 · VCS · Alaska

Report ID: CM-7856EFEC · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.2
Transparency (25%)	6.0
Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some structural strengths (VVB-confirmed additionality, 10% buffer pool, many supporting documents) but has significant reliability issues: historical over■issuance and multiple contradictions in ERR/leakage and safeguards records. These inconsistencies lower confidence in credits and increase over■crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-872
Sector	other
Country	Alaska
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	VM0012 1.2
Crediting Period	2006 — 2035
VVB	Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.
Verified ERs	32,675 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	51 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

■ Historical over■issuance/error in risk credit calculation reported (notification dated 2012)

■ Multiple contradictory figures for emissions reductions and leakage (different validation/monitoring reports)

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ additionality confirmed by an independent VVB (Ruby Canyon Environmental) via an investment test (validation report)

- historical error/over■issuance of risk credits reported (notification from VCSA cited in verification report), and contradictory reversal/leakage records across validation and monitoring reports

Additionality is supported: the validation report confirms an investment test and the VVB (Ruby Canyon Environmental) verified additionality. A 10% buffer pool is documented, and the baseline is project■specific with a reassessment in 2016. However, integrity is weakened by an historical notification of an error that caused over■issuance of risk credits (Rainforest Alliance received notice from VCSA dated 18 September 2012) and by contradictory records on reversals and leakage (see contradictions). These reliability issues reduce confidence in baseline/leakage treatment and permanence.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ large evidence base (49 docs used, monitoring and validation reports, PDD, issuance) and recent monitoring period reported (2022)

~ uncertain: key measured quantities conflict between validation/monitoring reports (e.g. total ERR and leakage deduction), reducing reliability of published figures

The project has substantial documentation (49 documents including monitoring and validation reports, PDD and issuance records) and a recent monitoring period covering 2022. Nevertheless, transparency suffers because key metrics are inconsistent between documents: total emissions reductions claimed vs verified vary widely across validation reports and monitoring reports, and leakage deductions changed between earlier and later reports. These contradictions make it hard to trust reported totals without further reconciliation.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- over■crediting risk: substantial discrepancies between claimed and verified ERR (e.g. claimed 100,789 vs later verified 32,675 across validation reports)

+ not CORSIA■eligible (reduces one avenue of double claims), and a 10% buffer pool is in place

There is a clear over■crediting risk signalled by conflicting ERR figures (for example, a claimed total of about 100,789 in an earlier validation report vs a later verified total of 32,675). Leakage treatment changed (20% in a 2019 validation vs 0% in a 2023 validation), which materially affects crediting. On the positive side the project is reported as not CORSIA■eligible and a buffer pool exists, but CCP status is not stated, so dual■claim risk cannot be fully excluded.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ many supporting documents and high extraction confidence (49 docs, min extraction confidence: high)

~ uncertain: contradictory findings across validation and monitoring reports (safeguards, leakage, ERR), indicating record inconsistency

Documentation breadth and recency are good: the merged record includes validation and monitoring reports, PDD and issuance documents with the latest monitoring report dated 2023■12■06 and validation material up to 2023■12■21; extraction confidence is high. However, multiple contradictions across documents (leakage, ERR totals, FPIC/grievance, safeguards, benefit sharing) indicate inconsistent recordkeeping or unresolved issues, lowering the documentation score.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB■confirmed
Permanence	buffer present; historical error
Leakage	quantified but inconsistent
Baseline	project baseline; reassessed 2016
Safeguards	partially documented; contradictory FPIC/grievance
Double-claim	CORSIA no, CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled err ledger and an independent statement reconciling claimed vs verified emissions reductions, including corrective actions for the 2012 over■issuance

→ Provide clear, dated evidence on leakage methodology and justification (explain transition from 20% to 0%), plus explicit statements on FPIC, grievance mechanism and benefit■sharing

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Registration Review Report
- AFOLU Project Element
- Registration Representation
- Non-permanence risk report
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation

Report ID: CM-7856EFEC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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