

QUALITY REPORT

Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation in Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary

VCS-1650 · Verified Carbon Standard · Cambodia

Report ID: CM-2BD806DB · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS REDD+ avoidance project using VM0015 with additionality confirmed by the VVB and a stated buffer contribution of 10%. However, several internal inconsistencies across documents (especially on safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and reversal treatment) reduce confidence in the reliability and completeness of the record.

Project Details

Registry	Verified Carbon Standard
Registry ID	VCS-1650
Sector	redd
Country	Cambodia
Vintage	2017, 2021
Project Methodology	VM0015 1.1
Crediting Period	2010 — 2069
VVB	Aster Global Environmental Solution Inc
Verified ERs	4,071,597 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	37 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ Reversal risk treatment is inconsistent: one document indicates reversals were not addressed while another states none were reported.

■ Safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are contradicted between the validation report and a later monitoring report, raising social-risk and documentation reliability concerns.

■ Leakage is described as quantified but the leakage deduction is 0%, and earlier monitoring documentation reportedly did not address leakage justification.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record; reversal treatment is also inconsistent across documents.

The monitoring/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record). The project applies VM0015 with a project-specific baseline approach, and the extracted record does not state when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens baseline robustness over a long crediting period (2010–2069). A 10% buffer contribution is stated, but reversal events are inconsistently treated across documents, reducing confidence in permanence risk management.

Transparency — 6.6 / 10

- + Both claimed and verified ERs are available (4,523,996 claimed vs 4,071,597 verified) for the 2020–2021 monitoring period.
- Multiple cross-document contradictions (safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing and leakage justification) reduce MRV and disclosure confidence.

The monitoring report dated 2023-04-21 provides a clear monitoring period (2020-01-01 to 2021-12-31) and shows a meaningful gap between claimed and verified ERs (4,523,996 vs 4,071,597), which is a positive transparency signal because verification appears to have adjusted claims. However, the extracted record contains multiple contradictions between the validation report and monitoring report(s) on safeguards-related disclosures and on whether leakage justification was addressed, which undermines transparency and consistency of public reporting.

Claim Safety — 6.8 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream double-claiming/eligibility risks.
- Over-crediting risk signals remain due to project-specific baselines and inconsistent leakage/reversal narrative across documents.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible (registry/extracted eligibility field), which lowers the risk of certain high-profile aviation-related claims. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity labeling. Claim safety is moderated by the combination of a project-specific baseline, a leakage deduction of 0% despite leakage being described as quantified, and inconsistent treatment of reversal/leakage topics across documents, all of which can elevate perceived over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

- + A relatively large document set was used (37 documents including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance records).
- Minimum extraction confidence is only medium and several key topics conflict between documents, indicating record quality issues.

The extracted record indicates a substantial evidence base (37 documents) including a PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance information. Minimum extraction confidence is medium, implying at least some limitations in readability/structure that can affect data reliability. The presence of repeated contradictions on core safeguards and risk-management topics suggests documentation is not fully coherent across the project's document set, lowering the documentation score despite the volume of sources.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Buffer stated, but reversal treatment inconsistent
● Leakage	Quantified narrative but 0% deduction and inconsistent disclosure
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance reported but contradicted across documents
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, consistent permanence/reversal risk section across validation and monitoring documents, including whether any reversals occurred and how they are detected and accounted for.

→ Publish a reconciled safeguards package (FPIC evidence, grievance mechanism procedures, and benefit-sharing terms) with consistent statements across validation and monitoring reports, and clarify leakage quantification and why the deduction is 0%.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- CCB Monitoring Report Draft
- CCB MR Summary
- CCB Monitoring Report
- Monitoring Report
- CCB MR Summary Draft
- CCB Other
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- AFOLU Project Element
- AFOLU Project Element Assessment
- Non-permanence risk report
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- CCB Verification Statement
- Verification Report
- Validation Report
- CCB 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-2BD806DB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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