

QUALITY REPORT

Banco de Hábitat, Bosque de Niebla - El Globo

CM-8c2841 · Biotrust · Colombia

Report ID: CM-592D97D6 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.8

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.2
■ Transparency (25%)	2.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.0
■ Documentation (15%)	3.6

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the single available monitoring report (Dec 2020), key integrity elements such as baseline setting, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, and permanence/reversal risk management are not evidenced in the extracted record. Safeguards are mentioned, and no material findings or corrective actions are reported, but the overall evidentiary basis is too thin to support high-confidence biodiversity credit quality claims.

Project Details

Registry	Biotrust
Registry ID	CM-8c2841
Sector	other
Country	Colombia
Vintage	2022
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No baseline approach or reassessment timing found in the extracted record, making it hard to judge whether credited outcomes are additional.
- No additionality test or third-party confirmation of additionality found in the extracted record.
- No leakage deduction or justification found in the extracted record.
- No permanence tools (e.g., buffer pool) or reversal event reporting found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.2 / 10

- Baseline, additionality, leakage, and permanence/reversal provisions are not stated in the available monitoring report (Dec 2020).

+ The monitoring report (Dec 2020) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.

The monitoring report (Dec 2020) does not provide an additionality test, a baseline method, or any baseline reassessment timing in the extracted record, which materially weakens confidence that outcomes are additional. Leakage is not quantified and no leakage justification is captured from the monitoring report (Dec 2020). Permanence risk management is also not evidenced: no buffer pool contribution and no reversal event reporting are found in the extracted record. While the monitoring report (Dec 2020) indicates no material findings and no corrective actions required, that alone is insufficient to establish robust integrity without the missing core design elements.

Transparency — 2.8 / 10

- Registry details, monitoring period, verifier identity, and quantified results are not found in the extracted record from the monitoring report (Dec 2020).

~ Safeguards are mentioned in the monitoring report (Dec 2020), but supporting details (FPIC, grievance mechanism) are not evidenced.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record from the monitoring report (Dec 2020) lacks the monitoring period, registry information, verifier identity, and any quantified results that would allow independent scrutiny. The monitoring report (Dec 2020) mentions safeguards, but the extracted record does not include FPIC, a grievance mechanism, or benefit-sharing details. With only one document available, the public audit trail and MRV completeness cannot be confirmed.

Claim Safety — 3.0 / 10

- Eligibility/labeling signals (CORSIA eligibility and CCP status) are not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.

- No quantified credited outcome (claimed vs verified) is found in the extracted record from the monitoring report (Dec 2020).

Claim safety is constrained by the absence of quantified outcomes (no claimed or verified totals are found in the extracted record from the monitoring report, Dec 2020), which increases over-crediting/over-claiming risk. The extracted record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so downstream users cannot easily assess whether the unit could be marketed under multiple quality labels. Missing baseline and leakage information further increases the risk that credited biodiversity outcomes could be overstated.

Documentation — 3.6 / 10

- Only one document (a monitoring report dated Dec 2020) is available; key program elements are missing from the extracted record.

~ Extraction confidence is medium, but the absence of a VVB name and verification details limits assurance.

Documentation is partial: only a monitoring report (Dec 2020) is listed, with no PDD, methodology reference, verification report, or registry record captured in the extracted record. The extraction confidence is medium, but key assurance fields (such as the VVB name and additionality confirmation) are not present in the extracted record. The absence of corrective actions and material findings in the monitoring report (Dec 2020) is a positive signal, but it does not compensate for missing foundational documentation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence tools/reversal reporting not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not evidenced in extracted record
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned but details missing
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and/or methodology reference with a clear baseline approach, additionality demonstration, and leakage assessment (including any quantified deduction).

→ Publish verification/assurance information (VVB name, scope, monitoring period, and quantified results) and document safeguards implementation (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit-sharing).

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report

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-592D97D6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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