

Resposta enviada 2 de maio de 2022:

As a standard-setting body, Verra oversees the creation of standardized methodologies that reflect the majority vies of most experts, and then we create a process through which independent auditors can valdate and verify projects under those methodologies. Then Verra checks their work and takes care of tacking and tracing credits to avoid double-counting. This project was audited by several VVBs under both VCS and the Social Carbon standard. I can reach out to all of them for comment and then cross-check their answers with our team, but to do so I will need either time to read all of these through, which I haven't yet had, or some very clear and concrete questions from you. You asked about ownership, and I told you what the VVB that did the initial validation said, and I'm reaching out to the others as well, but I want to come to them with clear and concrete questions that aren't answered elsewhere.

Resposta enviada em 28 de abril de 2022:

Hey, Beatriz, you can find the answer to your first question in the VCS rules – under section 3.6:

https://verra.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/VCS_Standard_v4.0.pdf.

There you will see the landowner can grant control to the project developer.

In this case, as you pointed our, the project developer did say it owns the land, but it's possible they meant ownership in accordance with the VCS rules.

According to the validation report, the project validator did review the documents and found them in order. You can find that here:

https://registry.verra.org/mymodule/ProjectDoc/Project_ViewFile.asp?FileID=18200&IDKEY=dq934lkmsad39asjdkfj90qlkalsdkngaf98ulkandDfdvDdfh025097800

As I read the above report, the VVB, TÜV Rheinland Greater China, confirmed ownership in the classic sense. I don't know enough about Brazilian law to understand your claims to the contrary or to know what "facts" you want us to respond to. We can reach out to the VVB to get more details, but that will take a while.

I don't speak Portuguese, but I ran your article through Google Translate, and it came through pretty muddled.

Even allowing for bad translation, there seem to be some errors and confusion. The additionality concerns around the protected areas, for example, were addressed in the PDD. Furthermore, you referenced a validation report generated under the Social Carbon standard, not under VCS. I can see how this would happen because Social Carbon is recognized by VCS, which is why that document has the VCS stamp and is in the registry. The actual VCS validation document is the one I link to above.

The benefit-sharing issues you raise are concerning, but it will take time to look into them, for reasons you can see in the link below. In the past few months, the number of media and general information requests have increased geometrically, along with demands for auditing and stakeholder support.

<https://verra.org/pardon-our-dust-how-verra-is-meeting-the-demands-of-tomorrows-carbon-market/>