QUALITY REPORT

REDD+ Project Magnolios de Yarumal

VCS-2317 · VCS · Colombia

Report ID: CM-EEBD8432 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.8
Transparency (25%)	5.4
Claim Safety (25%)	5.9
Documentation (15%)	4.8

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

Assessment Summary

This REDD+ project shows some solid integrity features, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and a 22% buffer pool. However, documentation quality is weakened by many corrective action and clarification requests, missing key monitoring details, and a contradiction on whether leakage was addressed in earlier versus later documents. Overall, the project looks moderately credible but not low-risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2317
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Colombia
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VM0015 1.1
Crediting Period	2016 — 2036
VVB	Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

■ The verification package required 15 corrective action requests, 8 additional documentation requests, and 30 clarification requests, which signals material documentation weaknesses.

■ A contradiction exists on leakage treatment: an earlier document said leakage was not addressed, while a later document says it was quantified; the later, more recent source was privileged, but the inconsistency still reduces reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test, which supports the project's additionality case.

+ Leakage is treated with a quantified 15% deduction and the project has a 22% buffer pool, but reversal events are not addressed in the extracted record.

The project has meaningful positive integrity signals: the VVB confirmed additionality through a barrier test, the leakage deduction is quantified at 15%, and a 22% buffer pool is in place. At the same time, reversal risk is not clearly addressed in the extracted record, and the baseline is project-specific rather than recently reassessed. These factors keep integrity above average but not strong.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring period is stated as 2016-02-23 to 2020-10-23, and the VVB is identified as Ruby Canyon Environmental, Inc.

- Key MRV fields such as total credits claimed versus verified, usage monitoring method, and CORSIA status are not stated in available documents.

Transparency is mixed. The monitoring period and VVB are identified, but the extracted record does not state total credits claimed or verified, the usage monitoring method, or any CORSIA eligibility. The absence of these core MRV details limits public traceability and makes the documentation less transparent.

Claim Safety — 5.9 / 10

+ A quantified leakage deduction and a project-specific baseline reduce some over-crediting risk.

- The baseline was project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and the contradiction on leakage justification creates some reliability concern.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a quantified leakage deduction and a project baseline, which are better than an unqualified claim. However, the baseline is not jurisdictional, and the contradiction on leakage treatment means the evidence trail is not fully consistent. With CORSIA and CCP status not stated, dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out.

Documentation — 4.8 / 10

+ The record includes multiple official-document extracts and names the VVB, methodology, monitoring period, and crediting period.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification package triggered many corrective action, documentation, and clarification requests.

Documentation quality is weakened by the large number of corrective action requests, additional documentation requests, and clarification requests in the verification process. The extraction confidence is medium, and several important fields are missing from the available record. The project is documented enough to assess, but not cleanly or comprehensively.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
Permanence	buffer pool present, reversal treatment unclear
Leakage	quantified 15% deduction
Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete verification and monitoring package with verified versus claimed issuance, usage monitoring details, and a clear statement on CORSIA and CCP status.

→ Resolve the leakage and permanence evidence gaps by documenting the final leakage rationale, any reversal monitoring, and how corrective action requests were closed.

Documents Reviewed

- VCS-Issuance-Representation-Multiple-Representors-v4.1_adjust (1).pdf
- 231109_RCE_VCSProject Description_REDD+Magnolios_RevSP_Clean.pdf
- VCS-Registration-Representation-Multiple-Representors-v4.1_adjust (1).pdf
- 220105-VCS-Non-Permanence-Risk-Report_Magnolios_English_adjust_CRI.pdf
- 2317 Extension.pdf
- 5_Project Zone_REDDMagnolios (1).kml
- 2_VCS-Listing-Representation-Multiple-Representors-v4.1_REDDMagnolios_Eng_firmSP.pdf
- Verra-Registry-CA_Signed.pdf
- 20200526_VCS-Project-Draft_listing_Description-Magnolios_JMI_CRI_JMI.pdf
- VCS-Joint-Validation-Verification - REDD+ Magnolios 2.6_final.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation - REDD+ Magnolios 1.0_adjust.pdf

Report ID: CM-EEBD8432 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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