QUALITY REPORT

REDD+ JIGRANTU Project

CM-1efc1c · BCR Standard · Colombia

Report ID: CM-CF85B192 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	3.7
	Transparency (25%)	6.1
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some core integrity elements documented, including VVB-confirmed additionality and stated social safeguards (FPIC and a grievance mechanism). However, key quantifications that underpin credit quality—baseline approach, leakage treatment, buffer/non-permanence provisions, and verified ERs—were not found in the extracted record, which increases over-crediting and claim-risk uncertainty.

Project Details

Registry	BCR Standard
Registry ID	CM-1efc1c
Sector	redd
Country	Colombia
Vintage	2019, 2020, 2021, 2022
Project Methodology	BCR0002 3.1
Crediting Period	2019 — 2049
VVB	ICONTEC
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record (PDD/validation/monitoring), limiting confidence in avoided-deforestation additionality and crediting levels.
- Leakage deduction and justification were not found in the extracted record, despite leakage being a material risk for REDD+ projects.
- Non-permanence risk management (buffer pool or equivalent) and any reversal reporting were not found in the extracted record.
- No claimed or verified emission reductions were found in the extracted record for the stated monitoring period (2019–2022).
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.7 / 10

+ The validation/verification documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (validation report).

- Baseline method, leakage treatment, and buffer/non-permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record (PDD/monitoring report).

The validation report indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports the additionality case. However, the baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record (PDD/validation/monitoring), which is a major integrity gap for REDD+ crediting. Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) and non-permanence risk management (buffer pool or equivalent) were also not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in net credited reductions and permanence controls.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ A named VVB (ICONTEC) and a clearly stated monitoring period (2019-02-01 to 2022-12-31) are provided (monitoring report).

- Claimed vs verified ER totals and key MRV parameters (baseline and leakage quantification) were not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (dated 2024-08-26) clearly states the monitoring period as 2019-02-01 to 2022-12-31 and identifies the VVB as ICONTEC. No claimed or verified emission reduction totals were found in the extracted record, preventing a basic cross-check of MRV outputs. Key methodological disclosures that typically enable third-party scrutiny—baseline method and leakage quantification—were also not found in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

~ CORSIA and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, leaving eligibility/label-claim risk unclear.

- Missing baseline and leakage quantification increases over-crediting risk for an avoidance (REDD+) project (PDD/monitoring report not showing these fields in the extracted record).

Because the baseline method and leakage approach were not found in the extracted record, there is elevated uncertainty around over-crediting risk for an avoidance (REDD+) project. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot reliably infer whether additional aviation/CCP-related claims are appropriate. The absence of extracted claimed/verified ER totals further increases the risk of miscommunication or unsupported marketing claims about delivered outcomes.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Three core document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- Despite document availability, several critical quantitative fields (ER totals, baseline, leakage, buffer) were not found in the extracted record.

The extracted record includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report (three documents) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, which supports document reliability. The monitoring report is recent (2024-08-26) and covers a multi-year monitoring period. However, several critical quantitative items (claimed/verified ER totals, baseline method, leakage deduction/justification, buffer pool) were not found in the extracted record despite these documents being present, indicating completeness gaps in what was captured or disclosed.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality
● **Permanence**	Buffer/reversal info not found
● **Leakage**	Leakage treatment not found
● **Baseline**	Baseline method not found
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose (or extract) the baseline method and the date/results of the most recent baseline reassessment, with enough detail to reproduce key baseline assumptions.

→ Provide quantified leakage assessment (justification plus any deduction) and clearly document non-permanence risk management (buffer pool percentage or equivalent) and any reversal monitoring outcomes.

→ Publish the claimed and verified emission reductions for the 2019–2022 monitoring period and reconcile them to registry issuance/retirement records.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification Report

Report ID: CM-CF85B192 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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