

## QUALITY REPORT

# Proyecto Carbono CAS

ECO-73 · CerCarbono · Colombia

Report ID: CM-BCB6FA16 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 5.1

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

## Assessment Summary

The project shows some core integrity elements (VVB involvement and a stated buffer pool with no reversals reported), but key quantification and baseline details are missing from the extracted record. Multiple inconsistencies between the validation and monitoring reports on safeguards and social process claims reduce confidence and increase reputational/greenwashing risk.

## Project Details

Registry	CerCarbono
Registry ID	ECO-73
Sector	other
Country	Colombia
Vintage	2008
Project Methodology	METODOLOGÍA M/UT/F-A01 V1.1
Crediting Period	2008 — 2028
VVB	ICONTEC
Monitoring Period	2017 — 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, limiting confidence in removal additionality and crediting robustness.
- Leakage is only described as negligible, with no leakage deduction percentage stated in the extracted record.
- Safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are contradictory between the validation report (claims present) and the monitoring report (claims absent).
- No verified or claimed total removals/ERR figures were found in the extracted record, limiting auditability of outcomes.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The monitoring report (2023-06-22) reports no reversal events and the project applies a 15% buffer pool.
- The baseline method and reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, and leakage is not quantified beyond being described as negligible in the monitoring report (2023-06-22).

The monitoring report (2023-06-22) indicates a 15% buffer pool and reports no reversal events, which supports permanence management for a removal project. Additionality is stated as confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, but the type of additionality test is not found, limiting robustness. The baseline method and the date of any baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record, which is a major integrity gap for quantifying removals. Leakage is described as negligible in the monitoring report (2023-06-22), but no leakage deduction percentage is provided in the extracted record.

### Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + A named VVB (ICONTEC) is identified and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2017-11-30 to 2022-09-14) in the monitoring report (2023-06-22).
- Total claimed and verified removals/ERR values were not found in the extracted record, reducing traceability of results.

The monitoring period is clearly defined (2017-11-30 to 2022-09-14) in the monitoring report (2023-06-22), and the VVB is identified as ICONTEC. However, total claimed and total verified removals/ERR values were not found in the extracted record, preventing an external reader from reconciling issuance quantities to monitoring outcomes. The registry is listed only as "other" and CCP status was not found in the extracted record, limiting completeness for third-party checks.

### Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.
- Missing baseline and quantified leakage treatment, plus contradictions on safeguards-related claims between validation and monitoring reports, increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

CORSIA eligibility is explicitly false in the extracted record, which reduces the risk of aviation-aligned claims. At the same time, the baseline approach is not found in the extracted record and leakage is not quantified beyond being deemed negligible in the monitoring report (2023-06-22), both of which elevate over-crediting risk. Contradictions between the validation and monitoring reports on FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, and safeguards increase reputational risk because social claims may be overstated or inconsistently evidenced.

### Documentation — 6.2 / 10

- + Three core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.
- Contradictions between the validation report (2023-06-14) and monitoring report (2023-06-22) on safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing reduce reliability of the documentation set.

The document set includes a PDD, a validation report (2023-06-14), and a monitoring report (2023-06-22), and extraction confidence is high, supporting basic documentation completeness. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is positive but should be interpreted cautiously given other gaps. The crediting period is long (2008-11-30 to 2028-11-28) relative to the monitoring period provided, and key quantitative outputs (total ERR) are not found in the extracted record, reducing practical usability of the documentation.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed, but test type not evidenced
● <b>Permanence</b>	15% buffer pool; no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Deemed negligible, not quantified
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not found
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance claims inconsistent
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline method and any baseline reassessment schedule in the public documentation, and clearly link it to quantified removal calculations.

→ Provide quantified leakage assessment (including an explicit leakage deduction percentage or a documented calculation supporting 0%) and reconcile safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing statements consistently across validation and monitoring reports.

## 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-BCB6FA16 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy