


QUALITY REPORT

"Grateful Planet" with the Indigenous Reserve Bajo Río Guainía and Río Negro

ECO-64 · CerCarbono · Colombia

Report ID: CM-F36C041F · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some core quality signals (VVB-confirmed additionality, FPIC and a grievance mechanism, and a stated buffer contribution), but key quantification and baseline details are missing from the extracted record. A material inconsistency on leakage treatment between validation and monitoring documents increases uncertainty and over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	CerCarbono
Registry ID	ECO-64
Sector	redd
Country	Colombia
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	REDD+ 1.1
Crediting Period	2018 — 2057
VVB	ICONTEC
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and timing of baseline reassessment are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual deforestation scenario.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the validation report does not address leakage while the monitoring report states leakage was quantified.
- No verified or claimed emissions reductions/removals totals are available in the extracted record for the 2021–2022 monitoring period.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test (validation report).
- Baseline method and leakage deduction value are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (validation vs monitoring).

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the validation record indicates the VVB confirmed additionality using a barrier test (validation report, 2022-10-12). However, baseline credibility cannot be fully assessed because the baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record. Leakage handling is also uncertain because the validation report does not address leakage while the monitoring report later states leakage was quantified, and the leakage deduction percentage is not provided.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + A defined monitoring period (2021–2022) and named VVB (ICONTEC) are provided (monitoring report).
- Claimed vs verified ER/ERR totals are not available in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency (monitoring/verification figures not found).

The monitoring report clearly states the monitoring period (2021-01-01 to 2022-12-31) and identifies the VVB as ICONTEC (monitoring report, 2023-12-29). However, the extracted record does not include the project's claimed or verified ER/ERR totals for that period, preventing a basic cross-check of performance. Registry/eligibility fields (e.g., CORSIA) are also not stated in the extracted record, reducing completeness for public-facing claims.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- Over-crediting risk is elevated because the baseline method is not stated and leakage quantification is not consistently documented (validation vs monitoring).
- ~ CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, leaving buyer-claim channel unclear.

Claim safety is constrained by missing and inconsistent core accounting elements: the baseline method is not stated in the extracted record, and leakage is described inconsistently between the validation report and the monitoring report. While a buffer pool contribution of 11.7% is reported, reversal events are not addressed in the extracted record, which matters for a long crediting period (2018–2057). CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess whether credits might be marketed under multiple quality labels.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.
- Some key quantitative fields are missing from the extracted record (e.g., ER/ERR totals, leakage deduction percent, baseline method).

Documentation coverage is relatively strong because three key document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report is recent (2023-12-29) and no material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record. Still, several critical quantitative fields (verified/claimed ER/ERR totals, leakage deduction percent, baseline method) are not captured in the extracted record, limiting auditability from the available structured data.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Buffer stated; reversals not addressed
● Leakage	Quantified claimed but inconsistent
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline method and the date/results of the most recent baseline reassessment in the public documentation and registry entry.

→ Publish (or extract into the registry) the claimed and verified ER/ERR totals for the 2021–2022 monitoring period, including the leakage deduction percentage and how it was calculated.

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-F36C041F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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