

QUALITY REPORT

ACP Sustainable Forest Cover Establishment Project

GS-1337 · GS · Panama

Report ID: CM-614D61C6 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.8
■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some solid integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage treatment, and a 20% buffer pool. However, permanence and monitoring clarity are weaker because reversal handling is not addressed in the extracted record and several key MRV fields are missing. Overall, this looks moderately credible but not especially transparent, with some reliability concerns from incomplete documentation and an unresolved leakage contradiction.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1337
Sector	other
Country	Panama
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	CarbonFix Standard v3.2 v3.2
VVB	Rainforest Alliance
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Reversal risk is not clearly addressed in the extracted record, despite this being an A/R project.
- The record contains a contradiction on leakage treatment: one document says leakage was quantified, while another says it was not addressed.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test.

- Reversal events are not addressed in the extracted record, even though the project is an afforestation/reforestation activity.

The PDD states that additionality was verified by the VVB and that the project used a combined additionality test, which is a meaningful positive signal. Leakage is treated as quantified with a 0% deduction, and the buffer pool is set at 20%, but reversal handling is not addressed in the extracted record, which is a notable weakness for an A/R project. The baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, and the baseline was not shown as recently reassessed.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ The verification body is named as Rainforest Alliance, and the project has documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism.

- The monitoring period, claimed and verified ER totals, and usage monitoring details are not found in available documents.

The verification body is identified as Rainforest Alliance, and the documents mention FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing, which helps with procedural transparency. But key MRV fields are missing from the extracted record, including the monitoring period, total ERs claimed and verified, usage monitoring method, and usage rates. That leaves the public evidence trail incomplete and makes it harder to assess issuance quality.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ Leakage is described as quantified with a 0% deduction in the PDD, which supports lower over-crediting risk if accepted.

- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible and CCP-eligible, which keeps dual-claim exposure relevant rather than excluded.

Claim safety is helped by the quantified leakage treatment and the absence of reported NCRs in the initial certification. Still, the project is marked CORSIA-eligible and CCP-eligible, so dual-claim exposure is not excluded by the available record. The contradiction on leakage treatment also weakens confidence in the over-crediting assessment.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- Several core fields are missing, including monitoring period, crediting period, baseline reassessment timing, and verified issuance totals.

Documentation quality is moderate: multiple official documents were used, the extraction confidence is medium, and the record includes a named VVB and some safeguard information. However, several important fields are missing or not stated, including monitoring period, crediting period, baseline reassessment, and verified issuance totals. The presence of open forward action requests also suggests the documentation package was not fully closed at the time of certification.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	buffer present, reversal handling unclear
● Leakage	quantified in PDD but contradicted
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible and CCP-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete monitoring report with verified and claimed ER totals, monitoring period, and usage monitoring details.

→ Resolve the leakage contradiction and document reversal risk management and baseline reassessment timing more clearly.

Documents Reviewed

- GS Performance Certification Report 09.29.2016.pdf
- GS Certification Report 16.12.2013.pdf
- GS Project Information 09.27.2017.pdf
- PDD_ACP_CFS.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1337
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1337

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-614D61C6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy