

QUALITY REPORT

Bosque Yungas Argentinas

CT-88 · Gold Standard · Argentina

Report ID: CM-83BE3D72 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.1 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV results) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high by default.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CT-88
Sector	other
Country	Argentina
Vintage	2021
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring results
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record

~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of source documents

No validation/verification, baseline method, reassessment timing, leakage deduction/justification, buffer or reversal information, or findings/corrective actions were found in the extracted record. With no evidence documents captured, integrity-relevant claims cannot be corroborated and must be scored conservatively.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed results were found in the extracted record

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured

No VVB identity, monitoring period, MRV methods, or claimed-versus-verified results were found in the extracted record. Because the evidence document list is empty, public traceability and registry completeness cannot be evaluated from the provided materials.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and key over-crediting risk parameters (baseline and leakage justification) were not found in the extracted record

~ Labeled as a contribution credit type, but supporting safeguards against misleading claims are not evidenced in the extracted record

Key indicators that reduce greenwashing/over-crediting risk—such as baseline approach, leakage justification, and eligibility/approval statuses—were not found in the extracted record. In the absence of substantiating documentation, the safety of downstream claims is uncertain and treated as high risk.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, so the assessment cannot be evidence-based

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability/quality of at least one key source

The extracted record includes zero documents and indicates low extraction confidence, implying at least one key document was poorly readable. This is a major evidence gap and materially limits confidence in any project attributes.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	No baseline method found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, validation/verification reports, and monitoring reports (with dates) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV results can be assessed

→ Provide registry screenshots/links and explicit statements on CCP/CORSIA status and safeguards (FPIC, grievance mechanism) to reduce claim and double-claim risk

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-83BE3D72 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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