

QUALITY REPORT

Carbono Reforestadora El Guásimo

ECO-49 · CerCarbono · Colombia

Report ID: CM-23AD9294 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This CerCarbono agroforestry project shows some integrity safeguards (VVB involvement and a 15% non-permanence discount), but key accounting elements like baseline and leakage treatment are not evidenced in the extracted record. Reported reversal/non-permanence risk handling is present, yet inconsistencies between the PDD and monitoring report reduce confidence. Overall, the project appears moderately documented but only moderately safe to claim due to missing baseline/leakage specifics and safeguards gaps.

Project Details

Registry	CerCarbono
Registry ID	ECO-49
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Colombia
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	M/UT/F-F-A01 1.1
Crediting Period	2007 — 2026
VVB	ICONTEC
Verified ERs	309,533 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk.
- Leakage was not addressed and no leakage deduction was found, which is a material gap for land-use projects.
- Safeguards information is inconsistent between the PDD and monitoring report, and FPIC/grievance mechanism are not evidenced.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation report referenced in the extracted record; VVB: ICONTEC).
- Baseline method and leakage treatment are not evidenced in the extracted record; reversal/non-permanence is flagged as an issue requiring a 15% discount (monitoring report, 2022-11-04).

The validation/verification chain appears present, with ICONTEC named as the VVB and additionality confirmed by the VVB (validation report referenced in the extracted record). However, the baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, and there is no evidence of baseline reassessment timing, which weakens baseline robustness. Permanence risk is material: the monitoring report (2022-11-04) describes a 15% discount (46,428 tCO₂e) to address non-permanence risk, indicating the project anticipates/recognizes reversal risk rather than demonstrating reversal-free performance. Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is evidenced, which is a significant integrity gap for land-use carbon accounting.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + Monitoring period is clearly stated (2019-10-02 to 2022-05-25) and verified ERs are reported as 309,533 tCO₂e (monitoring report, 2022-11-04).
- Total ERs claimed were not found in the extracted record, and leakage/safeguards reporting is incomplete or inconsistent across documents.

The monitoring report (2022-11-04) provides a clear monitoring period (2019-10-02 to 2022-05-25) and reports verified emission reductions/removals of 309,533 tCO₂e. However, the total amount claimed is not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to reconcile claimed versus verified outcomes. Key MRV elements relevant to land-use accounting—especially leakage treatment and baseline specification—are not evidenced, reducing transparency of the quantification. Registry details are limited (listed as 'other'), and CCP status is not mentioned, which also constrains external traceability.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + CORSIA eligibility is explicitly stated as not eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (extracted record).
- Over-crediting risk remains elevated because baseline and leakage quantification are not evidenced, and reversal/non-permanence is material (15% discount; monitoring report, 2022-11-04).

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-stakes aviation claims (extracted record). Nonetheless, claim safety is weakened by missing baseline and leakage information, both of which are central to avoiding over-crediting in agroforestry/soil carbon projects. The monitoring report (2022-11-04) indicates a non-permanence risk discount of 15%, which helps but also signals that permanence risk is non-trivial. Safeguards and stakeholder protections are not evidenced (no FPIC and no grievance mechanism found), increasing reputational/greenwashing risk for buyers making social or nature-positive claims.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

- + Three core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.
- Key fields are still missing or contradictory (baseline, leakage, safeguards), indicating documentation completeness issues despite having multiple documents.

The extracted record includes three key document types (PDD dated 2022-10-24, monitoring report dated 2022-11-04, and a validation report) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting a mid-to-strong documentation score. However, several critical fields remain unspecified (baseline method, leakage deduction, leakage justification), suggesting that either the documents do not contain these details or they were not captured in extraction. The presence of contradictions between the PDD and monitoring report on safeguards and reversal/non-permanence handling indicates internal inconsistency across documents. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, which is positive, but it does not compensate for missing core accounting disclosures.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality (test type not specified)
● Permanence	Reversal/non-permanence risk is material and reported (15% discount applied)
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed and no deduction evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced in extracted record
● Safeguards	Safeguards weak/inconsistent; no FPIC or grievance mechanism evidenced
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status not mentioned

What Would Improve This Score

- Disclose and consistently document the baseline approach (including reassessment timing) and provide enough detail to independently evaluate baseline validity.
- Provide a quantified leakage assessment (or a justified negligible leakage conclusion) and state any leakage deduction applied.
- Publish clear safeguards evidence (FPIC process, grievance mechanism, benefit-sharing) and ensure consistency between the PDD and monitoring/verification documents.

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-23AD9294 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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