

## QUALITY REPORT

# Doña Juana Landfill Gas-to-Energy Project

ECO-51 · CerCarbono · Colombia

Report ID: CM-E62214D5 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 5.6

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

## Assessment Summary

The project appears to have a credible additionality check confirmed by the VVB and includes basic safeguards elements (FPIC and a grievance mechanism). However, key quantification items for crediting integrity are missing in the extracted record (verified ERs, leakage deduction, and baseline reassessment timing), and there is a document-level inconsistency on whether leakage is treated at all.

## Project Details

Registry	CerCarbono
Registry ID	ECO-51
Sector	methane
Country	Colombia
Vintage	2024
Project Methodology	M/MLF-DE_RE01 2.1
Crediting Period	2023 — 2033
VVB	Colombian Institute of Technical Standards and Certification - ICONTEC
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the PDD indicates leakage is quantified, while the monitoring report does not address leakage.
- No verified emissions reductions/avoidance totals were found in the extracted record for the stated monitoring period, limiting confidence in issued-credit accuracy.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (ICONTEC).
- Leakage is not consistently treated and key quantification (leakage deduction and baseline reassessment timing) is not found in the extracted record.

Additionality is supported because the extracted record states it was confirmed by the VVB (ICONTEC), as reflected in the validation/verification documentation set. Baseline setting is project-specific (per the project documentation), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens robustness over a 10-year crediting period (2023–2033). Leakage integrity is a concern because the monitoring report (2025-06-20) does not address leakage and no leakage deduction is found in the extracted record.

### Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + Core project parameters are documented, including methodology (M/MLF-DE\_RE01 v2.1), monitoring period, and VVB identity (ICONTEC).
- The extracted record lacks claimed vs verified ER totals and key calculation inputs (e.g., grid emission factor), reducing MRV transparency.

The monitoring report (2025-06-20) clearly states the monitoring period (2024-02-01 to 2024-12-31) and the applicable methodology (M/MLF-DE\_RE01 v2.1), and identifies the VVB as ICONTEC. However, the extracted record does not include total emissions reductions claimed or verified for the period, and key calculation inputs like the grid emission factor/year are not found. This limits third-party ability to reproduce results from the extracted dataset.

### Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + Safeguards elements are present (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing described), lowering reputational risk.
- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, and leakage handling is inconsistent, increasing over-crediting/claims risk.

Safeguards-related items are comparatively strong in the extracted record: FPIC is indicated as conducted, a grievance mechanism is present, and benefit sharing is described (project documentation set). On the other hand, CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so downstream claims compatibility cannot be confirmed. The inconsistency on leakage treatment between the PDD and monitoring report increases over-crediting risk because it is unclear whether leakage was quantified and deducted in credited results.

### Documentation — 7.2 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.
- Several critical fields are not found in the extracted record (verified ERs, leakage deduction, baseline reassessment), indicating incomplete extractable evidence for key claims.

Documentation coverage is reasonably good with three key document types available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and high extraction confidence, suggesting the underlying files were readable. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is supportive. Still, several critical quantitative fields (verified ER totals, leakage deduction, baseline reassessment timing) are not found in the extracted record, reducing completeness for quality assessment.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance type, but reversal/buffer not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment inconsistent across documents
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or extract the monitoring/verification tables showing total ER claimed and total ER verified for 2024-02-01 to 2024-12-31, including uncertainty and any deductions applied.

→ Resolve leakage treatment explicitly in the monitoring/verification documentation by stating the leakage sources, quantification approach, and the final leakage deduction applied (or a justified negligible determination).

## 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-E62214D5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)