

QUALITY REPORT

Betulia Energy and Biodiversity Restoration Project in Honduras

GS-222 · Gold Standard · Honduras

Report ID: CM-A7C6B684 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project cannot be credibly assessed from the extracted record because no official documents were successfully used and the extraction confidence is low. With no evidence on additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, or safeguards, the project carries very high uncertainty and weak claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-222
Sector	arr
Country	Honduras
Vintage	2017, 2019
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- No official documents were successfully extracted or used for scoring.
- The project is not in the public registry, so public traceability is very limited.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- No additionality, baseline, leakage, or permanence evidence was found in the extracted record.
- Low extraction confidence means key project documents may be unreadable or missing.

No evidence was found in the extracted record for the additionality test, baseline method, leakage treatment, buffer pool, or reversal history, so integrity cannot be supported from documents. Because the extraction confidence is low, the absence of evidence is especially concerning rather than reassuring.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring report, verification report, or registry documentation was available in the extracted record.
- The project is not in the public registry, limiting public visibility and traceability.

Transparency is extremely weak because no verification report, monitoring report, or other official document was successfully used. The registry status is not in the public registry, which further limits independent review and public scrutiny.

Claim Safety — 1.0 / 10

- No evidence was found for baseline validity, leakage treatment, or over-crediting controls.
- The avoidance/ARR context suggests lower reversal risk than removals, but this is not documented in the available record.

Claim safety is very low because there is no documented basis to judge over-crediting risk, baseline validity, or leakage treatment. The project type is avoidance, which can reduce permanence concerns, but that cannot offset the complete lack of supporting evidence in the extracted record.

Documentation — 0.0 / 10

- Zero documents were successfully used, so documentation completeness is extremely weak.
- Low extraction confidence further reduces trust in the available record.

Documentation quality is effectively absent: no documents were used, no evidence list is available, and extraction confidence is low. This means the score is driven by missing information rather than positive project evidence, and the documentation gate would likely constrain transparency further in downstream scoring.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	No reversal evidence available
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	Registry status not public

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the full verification report, monitoring report, and project design document in machine-readable form.
- Publish registry evidence and clear statements on additionality, baseline method, leakage treatment, safeguards, and reversal/buffer arrangements.

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-A7C6B684 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy