

QUALITY REPORT

Bosques Solares de los Llanos 1

ECO-109 · CerCarbono · Colombia

Report ID: CM-F80629F8 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has a solid documentation set and an independent VVB (VERIFIT COLOMBIA S.A.S.) confirming additionality, with no material findings or corrective actions reported in the verification report (2022). However, key baseline parameters (including the baseline approach and grid emission factor details) were not found in the extracted record, and the large gap between claimed and verified reductions increases over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	CerCarbono
Registry ID	ECO-109
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Colombia
Vintage	2020
Project Methodology	ACM0002 20.0
Crediting Period	2020 — 2030
VVB	VERIFIT COLOMBIA S.A.S.
Verified ERs	37,202 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Very large difference between claimed (311,410) and verified (37,202) emission reductions, indicating a high risk of overstatement or MRV/baseline issues.
- Baseline approach and key baseline inputs (e.g., grid emission factor and reassessment timing) were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in baseline validity.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the verification report (2022).

- Baseline approach and reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, weakening baseline robustness.

The verification report (2022) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports integrity for an avoidance renewable energy project. Leakage is treated as quantified with a leakage deduction of 0%, but the extracted record does not show the underlying calculation or justification detail beyond that label (verification report, 2022). Baseline method, grid emission factor, and baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, which materially limits confidence that the baseline is conservative and current.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Monitoring period and crediting period are clearly stated in the verification report (2022).

- Key MRV inputs (grid emission factor, baseline method, and any fuel/non-renewable biomass parameters) were not found in the extracted record.

The verification report (2022) provides clear timing information (monitoring period 2020-08-22 to 2022-01-11; crediting period 2020-08-22 to 2030-08-21) and identifies the VVB (VERIFIT COLOMBIA S.A.S.). However, important MRV and baseline inputs (baseline approach, grid emission factor and year) were not found in the extracted record, reducing the ability for third parties to reproduce results. The presence of core supporting documents (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) helps, but key quantitative parameters remain missing from the extracted fields.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- The verified reductions (37,202) are far below the claimed reductions (311,410), increasing over-crediting/claims risk (verification report, 2022).

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not stated in available documents, leaving uncertainty for downstream claims.

The largest concern is the magnitude of the gap between claimed (311,410) and verified (37,202) emission reductions reported in the verification report (2022), which elevates greenwashing and over-crediting risk for public claims. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily determine whether the credits align with higher-integrity claim frameworks. With baseline method and grid factors not found in the extracted record, it is harder to assess whether the project could be overstating displacement of grid electricity.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are evidenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) alongside a dated verification report (2022-11-03).

- Several critical quantitative fields were not found in the extracted record (e.g., baseline method, grid emission factor), suggesting incomplete extraction or incomplete disclosure.

Documentation appears relatively strong: the extracted record references a verification report dated 2022-11-03 and lists key evidence documents (PDD, validation report, monitoring report), with high extraction confidence. The verification report (2022) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports completeness and auditability. Still, multiple critical fields (baseline method, grid emission factor, baseline reassessment timing) were not found in the extracted record, which weakens documentation quality from a user perspective even if documents exist.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
● Leakage	0% leakage with limited extracted justification
● Baseline	Baseline approach not found in extracted record
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Disclose and/or extract the baseline approach and key baseline inputs (grid emission factor value, year, and any reassessment details) so third parties can reproduce the ER calculation.
- Explain the drivers of the claimed-versus-verified reduction gap (e.g., data issues, eligibility, metering, baseline updates) and publish a clear reconciliation in the monitoring/verification package.

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-F80629F8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy