CARBONMELD CONSULTING

Comparative Brief: North American Forest Carbon (IFM)

Ten improved forest management projects, ACR and CAR, screened with the same methodology

Brief ID CM-BRIEF-14DB1E4 · Issued 2026-08-13 · 10 projects, same methodology · **SAMPLE**

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

Mandate & Method

Illustrative mandate: a corporate buyer seeking North American forestry credits from improved forest management projects, screening ten candidates registered with ACR or CAR. Every project is scored with the same CarbonMeld methodology (Integrity 35%, Transparency 25%, Claim Safety 25%, Documentation 15%) applied to public registry documentation only. No issuer input, no self-reported data.

Two findings cut across the whole set. First, not one of the ten projects discloses CORSIA or CCP eligibility status, so double-claim risk is unverified across the board: buyers who need labelled supply should request the status directly from the issuer before contracting. Second, baseline reassessment is missing in most of the cohort, a structural weakness of US IFM supply rather than a project-specific flaw.

Side-by-Side Comparison

Project	Code	Overall	I	T	C	D	Read
Anew - Shaan Seet Native Community Forestry Project	ACR-534	**8.0**	8.5	7.5	7.5	8.5	**Shortlist**
NativState - Bottomland Forests of the Mississippi Backswamps and Delta Mixed Forests (PDA)	ACR-1015	**7.4**	7.8	7.5	6.8	7.2	**Shortlist**
Buckeye Forest Project	CAR-1013	**7.4**	7.5	7.0	7.0	8.5	**Review**
Finite Carbon - Lyme Logan IFM	CAR-1205	**7.4**	8.0	6.5	7.5	7.5	**Shortlist**
Chugach Alaska Forest Carbon Project	CAR-1264	**7.2**	7.5	7.0	6.0	8.5	**Caution**
Blue Source-Wolf River Improved Forest Management Project	CAR-1209	**7.0**	7.5	6.0	6.5	8.5	**Review**
Blue Source - Northwoods Improved Forest Management Project	ACR-373	**6.9**	6.8	7.0	6.5	7.5	**Review**
Finite Carbon - Berry Summit	CAR-1004	**6.8**	7.5	6.5	7.0	5.5	**Caution**
Brushy Mountain	CAR-1095	**6.8**	7.5	6.5	6.0	7.0	**Caution**
SIG Carbon - Northeast Wilderness Trust - Alder Stream Preserve	CAR-1162	**6.8**	6.5	6.0	7.5	8.0	**Caution**

Scores reflect the latest registry audit on file for each project. I = Integrity, T = Transparency, C = Claim Safety, D = Documentation.

Shortlist

ACR-534 Shaan Seet Native Community Forestry (8.0) leads the set: strong verification oversight, conservative leakage treatment and a buffer contribution aligned to updated permanence risks. Early documentation inconsistencies were corrected in the latest review. Two caveats keep it from a higher read: no documented baseline reassessment, and benefit sharing described initially but found absent at verification - worth a direct question to the issuer.

ACR-1015 NativState Bottomland Forests (7.4) combines VVB-verified additionality with strong leakage management and recent monitoring data. The open item is a contradiction between validation and monitoring reports on reversal event treatment; resolving it in writing is a precondition for claim-sensitive use.

CAR-1205 Lyme Logan IFM (7.4) shows strong integrity, a substantial buffer pool and conservative leakage accounting. Historical discrepancies in emission-reduction totals were corrected in the latest verification, which improves reliability but documents past data-management gaps. Several MRV parameters are missing from the record.

Watchlist & Exclusions

CAR-1264 Chugach Alaska (7.2) scores respectably but carries a verified volume at roughly 2,450% of the pro-rata lifetime expectation, a potential over-crediting signal, alongside entirely missing safeguard documentation (FPIC, grievance, benefit sharing). Score alone would mislead here; it stays out of the shortlist.

CAR-1004 Berry Summit (6.8) fails on recency: all available documentation dates to 2013 against a century-long crediting period. CAR-1095 Brushy Mountain (6.8) and CAR-1162 Alder Stream (6.8) both lack social safeguard documentation, and Alder Stream also lacks explicit VVB confirmation of additionality in the available records. CAR-1013 Buckeye Forest (7.4) would be shortlist material on numbers, but its baseline methodology has not been updated since inception in 2013 and reversal reporting is ambiguous: Review, with a request for a current monitoring report.

How to Read This Brief

The comparison is only as strong as the public record: a project with thin documentation scores down on Transparency and Documentation even if its underlying forestry is sound. Before contracting, request baseline reassessment dates, eligibility status letters and safeguard documentation for any candidate; issuers that answer quickly and completely de-risk the purchase more than any score delta inside this table.