QUALITY REPORT

Sea Cave True Blue Carbon, Baja California, Mexico

CT-744 · ICR Standard · Mexico

Report ID: CM-3485A92A · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
4.2 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	3.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.0
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
	Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some social safeguard elements documented (FPIC and a grievance mechanism), but core carbon-accounting integrity elements are not evidenced in the extracted record (baseline approach, leakage treatment, and reversal/permanence provisions). A key inconsistency between the PDD and the validation report on whether additionality was verified by the VVB raises reliability concerns and increases over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	ICR Standard
Registry ID	CT-744
Sector	blue_carbon
Country	Mexico
Vintage	2025, 2026
Project Methodology	Sea Cave® True Blue Carbon® V1
Crediting Period	2023-08-01 — not_stated
VVB	Earthood
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Contradiction on whether additionality was verified by the VVB (PDD vs validation report), undermining confidence in additionality claims
- ■ Baseline approach not found in the extracted record, limiting ability to assess over-crediting risk
- ■ Leakage not addressed (no justification and no deduction stated) despite being a removal project where activity-shifting risks can be relevant
- ■ Reversal/permanence provisions not addressed (no buffer pool percentage stated; reversal events not discussed)

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

- Baseline approach and reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record (PDD/validation/monitoring set), limiting confidence in quantified removals
- Permanence and leakage are not addressed (no buffer pool stated; reversal risk not discussed; leakage justification absent)

The PDD describes additionality using a common-practice test, but the validation report does not confirm that additionality was verified by the VVB, weakening additionality robustness (PDD 2024-11-29; validation report 2024-04-19). The baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, which is a major gap for a removal project’s quantification integrity (PDD/validation/monitoring set). Permanence is not substantiated: reversal risk is not discussed and no buffer pool contribution is stated (monitoring report 2024-05-31). Leakage is also not addressed—no deduction percentage or justification is provided (monitoring report 2024-05-31).

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ Key project metadata and monitoring period are provided, and an independent VVB is named (monitoring report 2024-05-31; validation report 2024-04-19)
- Total verified/claimed removals were not found in the extracted record, reducing MRV transparency (monitoring report 2024-05-31)

The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2023-08-01 to 2024-10-01, and the VVB is identified as Earthood, which supports basic transparency (monitoring report 2024-05-31; validation report 2024-04-19). However, the extracted record does not include total claimed or total verified removals for the period, limiting the ability to reconcile issuance with monitoring results (monitoring report 2024-05-31). Key MRV parameters such as baseline method and leakage treatment are also missing from the extracted record, reducing auditability (PDD/validation/monitoring set).

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain double-claiming/eligibility marketing risks (extracted record)
- Additionality verification is inconsistent across documents and core quantification fields (baseline, leakage, ERR) are missing, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of CORSIA-related eligibility misclaims (extracted record). Nonetheless, over-crediting/greenwashing risk remains elevated because the baseline method is not found in the extracted record and leakage and reversal provisions are not addressed (monitoring report 2024-05-31). The inconsistency on whether the VVB verified additionality further increases claim risk because marketing statements could overstate third-party assurance (PDD 2024-11-29; validation report 2024-04-19).

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Three core document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with 2024 dates, supporting basic traceability

- Medium extraction confidence and an internal contradiction on additionality verification indicate documentation reliability gaps

The document set includes a PDD, a validation report, and a monitoring report, all recent (2024), which is a reasonable minimum package for review (evidence documents list; monitoring report 2024-05-31; validation report 2024-04-19; PDD 2024-11-29). Extraction confidence is medium, suggesting some readability/structure limitations that can hide key quantitative details. The presence of a direct contradiction between the PDD and validation report on VVB verification of additionality indicates documentation consistency issues that reduce confidence in the record.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	Test described but VVB verification disputed
● **Permanence**	Reversal risk/buffer not evidenced
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed
● **Baseline**	Baseline method not found
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clearly specified baseline method (including data sources, assumptions, and when it will be reassessed) and include it consistently across the PDD, validation, and monitoring documentation.

→ Add explicit permanence and leakage provisions: quantify any leakage deduction (or justify negligible leakage) and document reversal risk management, including any buffer pool contribution and monitoring/response procedures.

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-3485A92A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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