QUALITY REPORT

Forestry Restoration in Productive and Biological Corridors in the Eastern Plains of Colombia

CT-589 · BCR Standard · Colombia

Report ID: CM-AFC3C6DA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	5.2
Transparency (25%)	6.1
Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
Documentation (15%)	6.6

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

Assessment Summary

This afforestation/reforestation removal project is supported by a VVB-confirmed additionality assessment and has multiple core documents available. However, key permanence and leakage risk controls (buffer pool, quantified leakage deduction, and reversal reporting) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and there are cross-document inconsistencies on leakage treatment and safeguards.

Project Details

Registry	BCR Standard
Registry ID	CT-589
Sector	arr
Country	Colombia
Vintage	2016
Project Methodology	AR-ACM003 02.0
Crediting Period	2005 — 2025
VVB	Det Norske Veritas
Verified ERs	4,369,559 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (negligible in the validation report vs quantified in the monitoring report), and the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

■ Permanence risk controls are unclear: buffer pool contribution and any reversal-event reporting are not found in the extracted record for a long crediting period (2005–2025).

■ Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test.

- Permanence and leakage controls are not evidenced in the extracted record (buffer pool percentage, leakage deduction percentage, and reversal events not found).

The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (Det Norske Veritas) using a barrier analysis, which supports additionality robustness. The baseline is project-specific (per the monitoring report), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens confidence in baseline validity over a long crediting period (2005–2025). For permanence, no buffer pool contribution and no reversal-event reporting are found in the extracted record, leaving key risk controls unclear for a removal project. Leakage is described but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found, and the leakage approach is inconsistent across documents, reducing integrity confidence.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ Both claimed and verified ERs are available (4,935,375 claimed vs 4,369,559 verified) for the 2016-02-17 to 2020-10-01 monitoring period.

- Baseline reassessment timing and key monitoring details (e.g., usage monitoring method) are not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2021-09-10) provides a clear monitoring period (2016-02-17 to 2020-10-01) and discloses both claimed and verified ERs (4,935,375 vs 4,369,559), which supports MRV transparency. The VVB is identified (Det Norske Veritas), and no material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record. However, several important quantitative fields are not found (e.g., leakage deduction percentage, buffer pool percentage, baseline reassessment date), limiting reproducibility and third-party scrutiny. Safeguards-related disclosure is also inconsistent across documents, which reduces transparency confidence.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ Verified ERs are materially lower than claimed ERs, suggesting some conservativeness in issuance/verification outcomes.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, and leakage handling is inconsistent across documents, increasing over-crediting/claims risk.

Because verified ERs are lower than claimed ERs for the same monitoring period, the verification outcome suggests some constraint against over-crediting. That said, the baseline is project-specific and the baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents, which can elevate over-crediting risk over time. Leakage handling is a key claim-safety issue: the validation report treats leakage as negligible while the monitoring report describes it as quantified, and the actual deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims and buyer labeling.

Documentation — 6.6 / 10

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

- Safeguards and grievance/FPIC elements are weakly documented or absent in the extracted record (FPIC and grievance mechanism indicated as not present).

The extracted record includes three core documents (monitoring report, validation report, and PDD) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting document reliability. The monitoring report is relatively recent (2021-09-10) and covers a multi-year monitoring period, which is helpful for assessing performance. However, safeguards-related elements appear weakly evidenced: FPIC and a grievance mechanism are indicated as not present in the extracted record, and benefit-sharing is not described. Several key quantitative risk-control fields (buffer pool percentage, leakage deduction percentage, baseline reassessment date) are not found, indicating documentation gaps on critical quality determinants.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed barrier analysis
● **Permanence**	Buffer/reversal controls not evidenced
● **Leakage**	Inconsistent treatment; deduction not found
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment not stated
● **Safeguards**	FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and justify the quantified leakage deduction (percentage and calculation) in the monitoring/verification documentation, and reconcile the earlier “negligible” leakage position from validation with the later monitoring approach.

→ Provide explicit permanence risk controls (buffer pool contribution, reversal monitoring/reporting, and any remedial procedures) and document safeguards implementation (FPIC evidence, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing arrangements).

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification 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-AFC3C6DA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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