QUALITY REPORT

Pacajai REDD+ Project

VCS-981 · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-B8BC8F57 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.8 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	2.7
	Transparency (25%)	4.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.8
	Documentation (15%)	4.5

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some positive elements (VVB involvement, buffer pool, FPIC and grievance mechanism reported in recent documents) but has multiple unresolved verification findings and contradictory records across documents. Key weaknesses are lack of leakage justification, many corrective actions (including missing land records and monitoring evidence), and inconsistent emission reduction figures, which reduce confidence in integrity and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-981
Sector	redd
Country	Brazil
Vintage	2014, 2017
Project Methodology	VM0015 1.1
Crediting Period	2009 — 2048
VVB	EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	9,582,742 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	34 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Contradictory reported emissions: 9,582,742 tCO_2e vs 550,391 tCO_2e in older validation documents
- Leakage justification not addressed in the latest monitoring report while earlier reporting indicated quantified leakage
- Multiple corrective actions outstanding including missing land ownership records and land use change analysis
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.7 / 10

- multiple corrective actions required (land ownership records missing; patrolling evidence and land use change analysis not submitted) — monitoring report (2021)

~ additionality confirmed by the VVB via an investment test in the monitoring/validation record, but this is contradicted by earlier documents

Additionality is reported as confirmed by the VVB via an investment test (monitoring/validation reports), and a buffer pool of 11.75% is recorded in the recent validation report. However, the project uses a project-specific baseline under VM0015 with no baseline reassessment date stated, leakage justification is reported as not addressed in the latest monitoring report, and the verifier listed multiple corrective actions including missing land ownership records and land-use change analysis. These gaps and outstanding findings reduce confidence in additionality, baseline validity and leakage treatment.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ VVB named (EPIC Sustainability Services) and monitoring period provided (2012–2017) in the monitoring report

- key inputs missing or not stated in available documents (baseline reassessment date not stated; grid emission factor and usage monitoring not provided)

The verification and monitoring reports name the VVB (EPIC Sustainability Services) and provide a monitoring period (2012–2017) and matching verified ERR in the recent documents. Documentation coverage is broad (PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance; 27 documents), but extraction confidence is only medium and many core inputs are missing from the extracted record (grid emission factor, usage monitoring method, baseline reassessment). Contradictions across documents further weaken transparency.

Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

- baseline is project-specific (method VM0015 project baseline) with no recent reassessment stated, increasing over-crediting risk

- leakage treatment unclear: latest monitoring report states leakage justification not addressed and reports 0% leakage deduction, while an earlier report indicated quantified leakage

The project is not CORSIA-eligible and there is no evidence of CCP approval, which reduces double-claim risk. However, reliance on a project-specific baseline without a stated reassessment, an unclear leakage approach (0% deduction declared while earlier reporting claimed quantified leakage), and large, contradictory ERR figures raise over-crediting risk and make claim safety weak.

Documentation — 4.5 / 10

+ multiple evidence documents exist (PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) and 27 documents used

- extraction confidence medium and numerous outstanding corrective actions reduce documentation reliability

There is a relatively complete document trail (PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) and recent monitoring report dated 2021, but extraction confidence is medium. The verifier required multiple corrective actions that remain in the record (missing land records, missing evidence of patrolling and land-use change analysis, and missing declaration on other mechanisms). VVB independence appears normal (named VVB), but unresolved findings and medium extraction confidence lower the documentation score.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB confirms but contradicted
Permanence	buffer present; some uncertainty
Leakage	not addressed/unclear deduction
Baseline	project baseline; reassessment missing
Safeguards	mentioned but inconsistent
Double-claim	no CORSIA/CCP indication

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- CCB Monitoring Report Draft
- Monitoring Report
- CCB MR Summary Draft
- CCB PD Summary Draft
- AFOLU Project Element Assessment
- Registration Review Report
- Registration Representation
- Non-permanence risk report
- AFOLU Project Element
- Communications Agreement
- CCB Project Description Draft
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Report

Report ID: CM-B8BC8F57 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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