

## QUALITY REPORT

# VICHADA CLIMATE REFORESTATION PROJECT (PAZ)

GS-1806 · Gold Standard · Colombia

Report ID: CM-3327B674 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.4**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>4.4</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.8</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.2</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>4.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a Gold Standard reforestation project with VVB-confirmed additionality, a 20% buffer pool, and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, the record shows material findings, reported reversals, low extraction confidence, and several key gaps or contradictions that weaken confidence in the claimed climate benefits.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1806
Sector	arr
Country	Colombia
Vintage	2018
Project Methodology	Methodology for Afforestation/Reforestation (A/R) GHG emission reduction & sequestration 2.0
Crediting Period	2006 — 2036
VVB	Control Union Certification B.V.
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	34 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

## Red Flags

- Four material findings were reported in the 2025 monitoring report, and the extracted record does not show any corrective actions required, which limits confidence in the verification outcome.
- Reversals were reported and the project relies on a project-specific baseline; the record also contains a contradiction on the crediting period and a leakage justification that changed across monitoring documents.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test.
- Reversals were reported, and the monitoring report records four material findings.

The monitoring report confirms additionality through a combined test and shows a 20% buffer pool, which supports the project's structural integrity. At the same time, reversals were reported and the report lists four material findings, which materially weakens confidence in permanence and implementation quality. The project also uses a project-specific baseline, which is less robust than a recently reassessed standardized baseline.

### Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period, VVB name, and registry information are stated, and the project is Gold Standard certified.
- Total verified and claimed ER figures are not found in the extracted record, and extraction confidence is low.

The record identifies the VVB as Control Union Certification B.V., gives a clear monitoring period, and confirms Gold Standard certification. But the extracted facts do not include total claimed or verified emission reductions, and several operational details such as usage monitoring are not stated. Low extraction confidence further reduces transparency because at least one key document was poorly readable.

### Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- + The project is a removal project with a 20% buffer pool, which helps absorb reversal risk.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and leakage treatment is not clearly quantified in the extracted record.

Claim safety is mixed because the project is a removal activity with a buffer pool, but the baseline is project-specific and not shown to have been recently reassessed. Leakage is especially uncertain: the contradiction shows one monitoring document treated leakage as negligible while a later one says it was quantified, so I privileged the more recent 2025 monitoring report. The project is not shown to be CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved, but the absence of those statuses in the record still leaves some residual dual-claim uncertainty.

### Documentation — 4.0 / 10

- + A relatively large set of source documents was used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, appendix, and stakeholder consultation materials.
- Key fields are missing or not stated, and low extraction confidence suggests at least one important document was difficult to read.

Documentation breadth is decent, with 34 extracted facts and multiple source types including validation, monitoring, PDD, appendix, and stakeholder consultation materials. However, several key items are missing or only partially stated, including verified and claimed ER totals, baseline reassessment timing, and usage monitoring details. The low extraction confidence indicates that at least one important source was hard to read, which lowers reliability.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed test
● <b>Permanence</b>	buffer pool present but reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	leakage treatment inconsistent across reports
● <b>Baseline</b>	project-specific baseline
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of the leakage treatment, reversal accounting, and crediting-period discrepancy across monitoring reports.

→ Provide the verified and claimed emission reduction totals, plus a readable audit trail for the material findings and any follow-up actions.

## Documents Reviewed

- 430\_V1.3\_IQ\_SDG-Impact-tool\_VICH22.xlsx
- Ex ante projections.xlsx
- VICHADA CARBON MODEL 2019\_final201119\_2(1).xlsx
- Vichada23\_Monitoring-Report\_v3.pdf
- 3.5 - Template - Sustainability Monitoring Plan\_28112019(1).pdf
- 3.4 - PAZ15 Template - Sustainability Monitoring Plan.pdf
- Vichada24\_Monitoring-Report\_v4\_0625.pdf
- Forliance\_annual surveillance report.pdf
- 3.5 - Template - Sustainability Monitoring Plan\_28112019(2).pdf
- Monitoring Report
- VICH22\_PR2024\_Inverbosques\_130225-GS..xlsx
- CCIPL 1952\_Final Performance Certification Report v4.0 CC.pdf
- Vichada-Final\_Goldstandard\_V9\_0\_report-Final.doc\_D2\_TC.pdf
- T-PreReview\_V2.0-Stakeholder-Consultation-Report\_GS.pdf
- Vichada-Final\_Goldstandard\_V9\_0\_report-Final.doc\_D2\_TC(2).pdf
- Eligibility\_Report\_PR\_2024.pdf
- T-PreReview\_V2.0-Stakeholder-Consultation-Report\_2023.pdf
- 4.1 - PAZ15 Template - Additionality.pdf
- 2.1 - PAZ15 Template - Key Project Information.pdf
- 430\_V1.3\_IQ\_SDG-Impact-tool\_VICH24\_GS.xlsx
- FM evaluation report\_FSC C150409\_2024.pdf
- 3.2-PAZ15 Template-Local-Stakeholder-Consultation.pdf
- 101.5-Transition-Annex-Final\_14042020(2).pdf
- Vichada-Final\_Goldstandard\_V9\_0\_report-Final.doc\_D2\_TC(1).pdf
- CCIPL 2495\_Final Performance Certification Report Public (CC).pdf
- 101.5-Transition-Annex-Final\_14042020(1).pdf
- Project-Design-Document\_v6\_0625.pdf
- PAZ15-GS PDD.pdf
- PDD23\_updated\_PerRev\_GSID4221\_v4.pdf
- PDD\_30-10-2015.pdf
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1806
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1806
- 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-3327B674 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy