

QUALITY REPORT

Poechos I Project

CNN-699926 · Gold Standard · Peru

Report ID: CM-6CBAB36E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has third-party validation/verification involvement (DNV) and uses a recognized grid-connected renewable methodology (ACM0002), which supports baseline credibility. However, key quantifications needed to judge over-crediting risk (verified ERs, grid emission factor, leakage treatment) are not found in the extracted record, and several cross-document inconsistencies reduce confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-699926
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Peru
Vintage	2013
Project Methodology	ACM0002
Crediting Period	2004-04-01 — not_stated
VVB	DET NORSKE VERITAS
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2010
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Leakage is inconsistently treated across documents ("not addressed" vs "deemed negligible"), with no leakage deduction value found.
- No verified emission reductions and no claimed emission reductions were found in the extracted record for the stated monitoring period.
- Safeguards and stakeholder protections appear weak (no FPIC, no grievance mechanism, no benefit-sharing described).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the validation report (2005-07-29) and the project applies ACM0002.
- Leakage treatment is unclear/inconsistent and key baseline parameters (e.g., grid emission factor, reassessment timing) are not found in the extracted record.

The validation record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (DET NORSKE VERITAS) and the project uses ACM0002, which is a standard approach for grid-connected renewable electricity. However, leakage is not robustly handled: the validation report (2005-07-29) indicates leakage was not addressed, and no leakage deduction percentage is found in the extracted record. Baseline robustness is harder to judge because the grid emission factor and the date of any baseline reassessment are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + A specific monitoring period is stated (2009-04-01—2010-03-31) and the VVB is identified (DET NORSKE VERITAS).
- Core MRV outputs (claimed/verified ERs, grid emission factor) are not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2010-04-15) clearly states the monitoring period (2009-04-01—2010-03-31) and identifies the VVB as DET NORSKE VERITAS. Still, the extracted record does not include total emission reductions claimed or verified for that period, nor the grid emission factor used, limiting independent reproducibility. The registry is listed as CDM while the user states Gold Standard, which also complicates traceability in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.
- Contradictions on additionality approach and leakage justification increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

Because total ERs (claimed and verified) and the grid emission factor are not found in the extracted record, there is elevated uncertainty about over-crediting risk for this monitoring period. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so downstream claim compatibility cannot be confirmed. The safeguards picture is weak (the extracted record indicates no FPIC and no grievance mechanism), which increases reputational/greenwashing risk even for an avoidance renewable project.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

- + Multiple document types are available (monitoring report, PDD, validation report, stakeholder consultation) with 14 documents used overall.
- Corrective/clarification requests in the validation/assessment record indicate documentation gaps (e.g., missing Peru Letter of Approval in English).

The extracted record draws on multiple document types (monitoring report, PDD, validation report, stakeholder consultation) and indicates 14 documents were used, supporting moderate completeness. Minimum extraction confidence is medium, suggesting the documents were readable enough but not pristine. The presence of corrective and clarification requests (including submission of a Peru Letter of Approval in English and multiple CARs/CLRs) indicates that key compliance evidence was initially incomplete or unclear.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality (validation)
● Permanence	Avoidance renewable; no reversal risk indicated
● Leakage	Leakage not consistently justified; no deduction found
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; key parameters not found
● Safeguards	No FPIC or grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/confirm the monitoring and verification outputs for the period (claimed and verified ERs, grid emission factor and its source year) and reconcile them across documents.

→ Provide a consistent, validated leakage assessment (even if negligible) with an explicit leakage deduction (or justification for 0%) aligned across the PDD, validation, and monitoring documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- revised monitoring plan
- 01 Apr 2006 - 31 Mar 2007
- authorization
- approval
- 01 Apr 2004 - 31 Mar 2006
- Compilation of all comments received
- registration request form
- Explanation of taking due account of comments
- 01 Apr 2007 - 31 Mar 2009
- 01 Apr 2010 - 31 Mar 2011
- List of interviewed persons
- 01 Apr 2009 - 31 Mar 2010
- List of documents
- PDD (Stakeholder Process)
- project design document
- validation report of revised monitoring plan
- Validation Report including Validation Protocol and Information Reference List

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-6CBAB36E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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