

QUALITY REPORT

Tayazú

CT-60 · Gold Standard · Colombia

Report ID: CM-54AA9FD2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project facts beyond basic metadata, and the minimum extraction confidence is low. With no accessible evidence on baseline setting, additionality, leakage, permanence controls, or MRV results, the project cannot be assessed as high-quality based on the available documentation.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CT-60
Sector	redd
Country	Colombia
Vintage	2020
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, permanence, or MRV claims
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or misinterpreted critical information

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- No evidence found in the extracted record for additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, buffer/reversal provisions, or findings/corrective actions

~ REDD project type typically requires strong permanence and leakage controls, but these were not found in the extracted record

No project integrity determinants were found in the extracted record: there is no information on additionality testing, baseline methodology or reassessment, leakage deductions/justification, buffer pool contribution, or any reversal events. Because this is a REDD project type, the absence of permanence and leakage controls in the available record is a major evidence gap. With no verification/monitoring findings available, integrity must be scored conservatively.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (periods, VVB, errors, MRV methods) were found in the extracted record

- Registry-relevant fields (e.g., eligibility/status indicators) were not found in the extracted record

The extracted record contains no monitoring period, VVB name, MRV methods, or quantified results (e.g., claimed vs verified emission reductions). There are also no public-document indicators captured (no evidence documents listed), so transparency cannot be substantiated. Given the lack of extracted content, transparency is scored very low.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting and greenwashing risk cannot be screened because baseline approach, leakage justification, and MRV outcomes were not found in the extracted record

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unresolved

Claim safety depends on demonstrable conservativeness in baseline setting, leakage treatment, and verified performance, none of which were found in the extracted record. Eligibility indicators relevant to double-claim risk (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, so the risk cannot be bounded. As a result, the project is scored conservatively for claim safety.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided in the extracted record (0 documents used)

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing confidence that key requirements were captured

No documents were used in the extraction (0 listed), and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable. This combination implies a high likelihood of missing critical information and prevents cross-checking across documents. Documentation completeness and reliability are therefore scored extremely low (note: documentation < 3.0 would cap transparency under the gate rules).

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Permanence controls not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	Eligibility/status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, latest monitoring report, and latest verification report so baseline approach, additionality, leakage, permanence/buffer provisions, and verified results can be assessed

→ Provide registry and eligibility disclosures (VVB identity, monitoring periods, issuance/retirement records, and any CORSIA/CCP status statements) and ensure documents are machine-readable to raise extraction confidence

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-54AA9FD2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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