

QUALITY REPORT

Boyacompostar

VCS-263 · GS · Chile

Report ID: CM-ACEDB893 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage treatment in the monitoring report. However, the record also shows many corrective actions, missing key details such as buffer pool and baseline reassessment, and several contradictions between the validation and monitoring reports that reduce confidence. Overall claim safety is moderate to weak because the project is not CORSIA-eligible, the registry status is late to verify, and safeguards are inconsistently documented.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	VCS-263
Sector	industrial
Country	Chile
Vintage	2022
Project Methodology	AM0029 3
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Verified ERs	205,551 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2006 — 2009
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- A large number of corrective actions were required in the monitoring report, suggesting unresolved documentation or implementation issues.
- The monitoring report contradicts the validation report on safeguards and benefit-sharing, and it also leaves leakage justification and social safeguards inconsistently documented across sources.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the validation report.

- No buffer pool percentage, reversal history, or baseline reassessment date is stated in the available documents.

The validation report confirms additionality through an investment test and the VVB is identified as TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, which supports the project's core crediting logic. On the other hand, the monitoring report does not state a buffer pool contribution, reversal events, or a baseline reassessment date, so permanence and baseline robustness are only partially evidenced. The quantified leakage treatment helps, but the absence of several key risk controls keeps the score below average.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report provides matched claimed and verified issuance totals, both at 205,551 credits.

- The project has a late-to-verify registry status and the monitoring report lists many corrective actions, which weakens reporting confidence.

The monitoring report and issuance record show identical claimed and verified totals of 205,551 credits, which is a positive sign for registry consistency. However, the project has a late-to-verify registry status and the monitoring report lists numerous corrective actions, indicating that the public record is not especially clean or complete. The lack of a stated usage monitoring method also leaves an MRV gap.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.

- Leakage treatment is described as quantified in the monitoring report, but the earlier validation report reportedly said it was not addressed, creating a reliability concern.

Claim safety is helped by the fact that the project is not CORSIA-eligible, reducing the risk of overlapping aviation claims. Still, the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized or recently reassessed, and the leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents. Because the monitoring report says leakage was quantified while the validation report reportedly said it was not addressed, the reliability of the emissions claim is weakened.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ Multiple document types were available, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence.

- The monitoring report is dated 2011 while the crediting period ended in 2016, and the record still shows many unresolved corrective actions.

The evidence base is reasonably broad, with validation, monitoring, PDD, and issuance documents all present, and extraction confidence is high. Even so, the monitoring report is relatively old compared with the end of the crediting period, and it contains a long list of corrective actions. Social safeguard documentation is also inconsistent: the monitoring report says FPIC, grievance mechanisms, safeguards, and benefit sharing were not present, while the validation report said they were, so the record is incomplete and conflicted.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	no buffer or reversal detail stated
● Leakage	quantified but contradictory treatment
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	safeguards inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unstated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, reconciled explanation of the contradictions between validation and monitoring reports, especially for leakage, FPIC, grievance mechanisms, safeguards, and benefit sharing.

→ Publish complete permanence and MRV details, including buffer pool treatment, reversal monitoring, baseline reassessment, and the usage monitoring method.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification 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-ACEDB893 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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