QUALITY REPORT

ArBolivia- Phase II

GS-1797 · GS · Bolivia, Plurinational State of

Report ID: CM-564E322E · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.5

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	2.8
Transparency (25%)	1.9
Claim Safety (25%)	2.4
Documentation (15%)	3.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some basic safeguards on paper, including FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing, but the extracted record is too thin to support strong confidence in credit quality. Key elements for integrity and transparency, such as additionality confirmation, baseline method, monitoring results, and buffer treatment, are not stated in the available document.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1797
Sector	arr
Country	Bolivia, Plurinational State of
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AR-AMS0001 version 05
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- No baseline method, additionality test, or VVB confirmation is stated in the available PDD extract.
- Leakage is described as negligible, but no quantified deduction, monitoring evidence, or supporting justification is provided.
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.8 / 10

+ The PDD states a deemed-negligible leakage approach and includes benefit-sharing and safeguard language.

- Additionality is not documented in the extracted record, and reversal risk is not addressed beyond a generic statement that reversals are not addressed.

The available PDD mentions a deemed-negligible leakage approach and includes benefit-sharing, FPIC, and grievance mechanism language, which is directionally positive. However, additionality is not confirmed by a VVB in the extracted record, and the baseline method, buffer pool treatment, and reversal handling are not stated, which weakens confidence in permanence and baseline robustness.

Transparency — 1.9 / 10

+ The project identifies the methodology as AR-AMS0001 version 05 and the document date is available.

- No monitoring period, VVB name, claimed versus verified ER figures, or usage monitoring details are stated in the available documents.

Transparency is weak because the extracted record contains only the PDD and does not state the monitoring period, VVB name, or any verified versus claimed emission reduction figures. The methodology and version are identified, but the absence of monitoring detail and registry completeness information leaves major gaps in public MRV visibility.

Claim Safety — 2.4 / 10

+ The project is an afforestation/reforestation activity, which generally lowers some over-crediting concerns relative to avoidance projects.

- Baseline treatment, FNRB, and usage-rate assumptions are not stated, and leakage is only described as negligible without quantified support.

Claim safety is limited by missing evidence on the baseline, FNRB, and usage-rate assumptions, all of which are important for assessing over-crediting risk in ARR projects. The PDD's statement that leakage is deemed negligible helps somewhat, but without quantified leakage treatment or verification evidence, the claim remains only moderately safe.

Documentation — 3.2 / 10

+ The record includes a dated PDD and notes FPIC, safeguards, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing.

- Only one document was used, and many core fields are not stated in the extracted record, limiting documentary completeness.

Documentation quality is modest at best: there is a dated PDD, but only one document was used and many key fields are not stated in the extracted record. The extraction confidence is medium rather than low, which avoids a harsher penalty, but the overall documentary basis is still incomplete for a robust assessment.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	No additionality evidence stated
Permanence	Reversal treatment not addressed
Leakage	Negligible leakage not quantified
Baseline	Baseline method not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	Registry/eligibility status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verification report and monitoring report showing VVB-confirmed additionality, verified ERs, and the monitoring period.

→ Disclose the baseline method, buffer pool or reversal treatment, quantified leakage assessment, and registry/eligibility status.

Documents Reviewed

- PDD_ARB_CFS.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1797
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1797

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-564E322E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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