QUALITY REPORT

BIGCOAST FOREST CLIMATE INITIATIVE

CM-f8569c · VCS · Canada

Report ID: CM-CD4CA4F5 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.7 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.0
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS IFM project has some strong procedural signals (VVB involvement, no reported findings, and safeguards elements like FPIC and a grievance mechanism). However, key integrity-critical quantifications are missing in the extracted record (buffer pool contribution, leakage deduction, and verified ERs), and leakage treatment is inconsistent across core documents, increasing over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	CM-f8569c
Sector	redd
Country	Canada
Vintage	2018, 2019, 2020, 2021
Project Methodology	VM0012 1.2
Crediting Period	2018 — 2048
VVB	SCS Global Services
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is treated inconsistently: the PDD does not address leakage while the validation report deems it negligible, with no quantified deduction shown in the extracted record.
- ■ Reversal risk management is unclear: reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is found in the extracted record for a forest project.
- ■ No verified emissions reductions/removals total is found in the extracted record for the 2018–2021 monitoring period.
- ■ Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation report).

- Core IFM integrity parameters are missing or unclear in the extracted record (buffer pool contribution, leakage deduction, and reversal risk treatment).

The validation report indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. The baseline is project-specific (project baseline), and the extracted record does not show when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens confidence over a long 2018–2048 crediting period. For a forest IFM project, reversal risk management is not clearly evidenced here: reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool contribution percentage is found in the extracted record. Leakage is described as negligible, but the extracted record does not provide a quantified leakage deduction, and leakage handling is inconsistent across documents (see overall).

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Key project metadata is available (methodology VM0012 v1.2, monitoring period 2018–2021, VVB identified as SCS Global Services).

- The extracted record lacks headline MRV outputs (claimed and verified ER totals) and does not show quantified leakage treatment.

The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2018-01-01 to 2021-12-31, and the VVB is identified as SCS Global Services, which helps traceability. However, neither claimed nor verified total ERs are found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to independently assess MRV outcomes for the period covered by the monitoring report (2022-07-06). The project uses VM0012 version 1.2, but key quantitative outputs (e.g., leakage deduction percentage) are not present in the extracted record, reducing transparency of the accounting.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record (monitoring report dated 2022-07-06).

- Over-crediting risk remains due to unquantified leakage and missing verified ER totals; CORSIA/CCP status is not found in the extracted record.

Greenwashing/over-crediting risk is elevated because the extracted record lacks the verified ER total and does not show a quantified leakage deduction, despite leakage being a known risk channel for IFM. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record (monitoring report), which is a positive signal but does not substitute for missing quantitative disclosures. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on those labels to reduce double-claim or quality-risk concerns.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- A direct inconsistency between the PDD and validation report on leakage indicates documentation reliability issues.

Documentation coverage is reasonably strong with three core document types present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and high extraction confidence. The monitoring report is relatively recent (2022-07-06) for the 2018–2021 monitoring period, supporting recency. However, the contradiction between the PDD and validation report on whether leakage is addressed indicates an internal documentation inconsistency that should be resolved for auditability.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Buffer/reversal treatment unclear
Leakage	Negligible claim but not consistently documented
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and/or extract the verified ER total (and any uncertainty/adjustments) for the 2018–2021 monitoring period, including a clear reconciliation of claimed vs verified outcomes.

→ Provide explicit, consistent leakage treatment across the PDD and validation/verification documentation, including a quantified leakage assessment and any applied deduction, plus clear evidence of buffer pool contribution and reversal risk management.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- 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-CD4CA4F5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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