QUALITY REPORT

Regenerating Colombian Coffee Ecosystems

VCS-1682 · VCS · Colombia

Report ID: CM-3F55C8AA · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.4
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	Documentation (15%)	7.1

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS AFOLU soil carbon project shows some core integrity elements (VVB-confirmed additionality, buffer contribution, and safeguards processes), but several internal inconsistencies and missing registry uploads weaken confidence. The largest risks are around permanence/reversal reporting and inconsistent leakage and ERR figures across documents, which increases over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1682
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Colombia
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AR-AMS0007 03.1
Crediting Period	2014 — 2054
VVB	ECOCERT
Verified ERs	40,623 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

■ Reversal status is inconsistent between the validation report (no reversals) and issuance records (reversals reported).

■ Non-Permanence Risk Report was not uploaded to the Verra Registry, limiting independent review of permanence risk and buffer rationale.

■ Verified ERs differ across documents (40,623 in the monitoring report vs 45,136 in the validation report), creating uncertainty about the correct credited amount.

■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (quantified in the monitoring report vs deemed negligible in the validation report).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using a barrier analysis (validation report).

- Permanence/reversal information is not reliable because issuance records indicate reversals while the validation report states none, and the Non-Permanence Risk Report is missing from the registry.

The validation report confirms additionality using a barrier analysis and indicates VVB confirmation by ECOCERT. A 10% buffer contribution is reported and reversals are stated as none in the validation documentation, but issuance records indicate reversals were reported, which materially undermines permanence confidence. Leakage is shown as a 0% deduction with a quantified justification in the monitoring report (2023-10-11), yet the validation report (2018-05-30) describes leakage as deemed negligible, creating uncertainty about whether leakage was consistently assessed.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

+ Key project documents are referenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (monitoring report, 2023-10-11).

- Public MRV clarity is reduced by conflicting ER and leakage statements across documents and by the missing Non-Permanence Risk Report on the registry.

The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period (2014-04-20 to 2021-10-18) and the project is linked to VCS documentation with named VVB (ECOCERT). However, transparency is weakened by conflicting ER totals across documents and by inconsistent leakage narratives between validation and monitoring. The monitoring report also notes the Non-Permanence Risk Report was not uploaded to the Verra Registry, limiting third-party scrutiny of risk ratings and buffer calculations.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ A buffer pool contribution of 10% is reported, which can reduce non-permanence over-claiming risk (monitoring report, 2023-10-11).

- Over-crediting/claims risk is elevated by inconsistent verified ER totals and inconsistent leakage justification between validation and monitoring documentation.

Claims risk is moderate because the project uses a project-specific baseline approach and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, which can increase over-crediting risk over a long crediting period (2014-2054). The verified ER number is inconsistent between the monitoring report (40,623) and the validation report (45,136), so the safest interpretation is to privilege the monitoring/verification figure as the more directly MRV-linked value. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily infer alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks from the available data.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

+ Extraction confidence is high and multiple document types were used (11 documents including PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance).

- The record is incomplete because the Non-Permanence Risk Report is explicitly noted as not uploaded to the Verra Registry (monitoring report, 2023-10-11).

The extracted record draws on multiple document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and indicates high extraction confidence, supporting a relatively strong documentation score. Nonetheless, the monitoring report explicitly states the Non-Permanence Risk Report was not uploaded to the Verra Registry, which is a key missing artifact for AFOLU permanence assessment. The presence of numerous corrective actions (12 CARs, 4 CLs, 2 FARs) also suggests documentation and/or implementation issues were significant enough to require extensive follow-up.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● **Permanence**	Reversal status inconsistent; NPR report missing
● **Leakage**	0% deduction but inconsistent justification
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Upload the Non-Permanence Risk Report to the Verra Registry and clearly reconcile buffer determination, risk rating, and any reversal accounting.

→ Publish a reconciliation table across validation, monitoring/verification, and issuance showing claimed vs verified vs issued ERs and explaining the 45,136 vs 40,623 discrepancy, including any leakage treatment changes over time.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Non-permanence risk report
- Registration Representation
- AFOLU Project Element
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation

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-3F55C8AA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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