

QUALITY REPORT

Florestal Santa Maria Project

VCS-875 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-75D73706 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.0
■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows basic integrity controls (VVB involvement, buffer pool, quantified leakage justification and FPIC) but multiple contradictory figures across documents and a long list of corrective actions/NCRs reduce confidence. Key outcome figures (total verified reductions) and some governance items are inconsistent between documents, raising moderate risk of over-crediting or poor implementation.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-875
Sector	redd
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	VM0007 1.6
Crediting Period	2009 — 2039
VVB	Earthood Services Limited
Verified ERs	402,313.0 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	32 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Large contradiction in total verified emissions/removals (402,313 vs 6,076,632) undermines ERR reliability
- Multiple non-conformities and corrective actions (NCR 01/12 to NCR 07/12) in the monitoring report
- Leakage treatment described as quantified but leakage deduction percentage is not stated in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.0 / 10

+ Additionality confirmed by an independent VVB in the monitoring/validation materials (monitoring report 2024; validation report 2025).

- Large contradictory verified ERR figures across validation reports (402,312.98 vs 6,076,632) and multiple corrective actions, indicating reliability issues.

The monitoring report (2024) and a validation report (2025) confirm additionality via an investment test and the presence of a buffer pool (10%), and the project uses a project-specific baseline method last reassessed in 2019. However, there is a major contradiction in total verified reductions between earlier and later validation reports (402,312.98 in 2025 vs 6,076,632 in 2021) and multiple corrective actions/NCRs are required in the monitoring report (listed items and NCR 01/12–07/12). Leakage is described as quantified in the 2024 monitoring report but a leakage deduction percentage is not provided in the extracted record. These reliability and documentation issues reduce the integrity score.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ VVB named (Earthood Services Limited) and monitoring period disclosed (2019-04-13 — 2022-04-12); methodology and buffer pool percentage stated.

- Total ERR claimed not published / contradictory and several required MR clarifications (per corrective actions), reducing transparency of key numbers.

Positive elements: VVB is named (Earthood Services Limited), monitoring period and methodology (VM0007 v1.6) are disclosed, and the registry is VCS. Negative elements: the total ERR claimed is not stated in the extracted data, the total verified ERR shows large contradictory values across documents, and the monitoring report flags many template and transparency shortfalls (per corrective actions). Extraction confidence is high, so gaps are likely omissions in source documents rather than extraction errors, which lowers transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

+ Leakage is described as quantified in the monitoring report (2024), and a 10% buffer pool is documented in later validation materials.

- Missing explicit leakage deduction percentage and contradictions in baseline/additionality across older and newer documents raise over-crediting risk.

There is a quantified leakage justification reported in the monitoring report (2024) and a buffer pool is documented (10% in later validation materials), which reduces some over-claim risk. Offsetting risk remains because the leakage deduction percentage is absent from the extracted record, the baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and the catastrophic contradiction in verified ERR figures suggests possible over- or under-crediting historically. CORSIA/CCP status is not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be fully assessed.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ A relatively large document set (21 documents listed) and a named VVB with recent monitoring and validation reports (2024–2025).

- Numerous corrective actions and NCRs listed in the monitoring report, and several fields remain unstated in extracted records (e.g., total ERR claimed, leakage deduction %).

Documentation breadth is reasonable (21 documents, evidence list includes PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance). Extraction confidence is high. However, the monitoring report (2024) lists many corrective actions and NCRs indicating non-conformities with VCS monitoring template requirements, and several fields remain unstated across the record (total ERR claimed, leakage deduction %, usage monitoring). VVB appears independent but multiple older documents conflict with newer ones, requiring reconciliation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed but contradicted earlier
● Permanence	buffer pool present; some reversal concerns
● Leakage	quantified but deduction % not stated
● Baseline	project baseline; reassessed 2019
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance noted but inconsistently reported
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Reconcile contradictory ERR/issuance figures across validation and monitoring reports and publish a corrected, reconciled total ERR (with source/version and date).

→ Disclose the leakage deduction percentage and respond to each NCR in a corrective action report showing fixes and evidence, plus clarify any methodology deviations.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- AFOLU Project Element Assessment
- Non-permanence risk report
- Project Description
- Listing Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation 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-75D73706 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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