

QUALITY REPORT

# Sea of Change

VCS-1764 · VCS

Report ID: CM-D10828C7 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>4.8</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>4.2</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.1</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.6</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.3</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This VCS blue carbon removal project has VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated buffer contribution, but integrity is weakened by multiple corrective action requests affecting baseline applicability, area accounting, QA/QC, and uncertainty treatment. Transparency is moderate due to a clear monitoring period and matching claimed vs verified ERs in the extracted record, but several cross-document contradictions and missing baseline reassessment details increase reliability risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1764
Sector	blue_carbon
Vintage	2020
Project Methodology	AR-AM0014 03
Crediting Period	2015 — 2035
VVB	Ecolance Private Limited
Verified ERs	60,226 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	38 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Corrective actions cite missing uncertainty calculation, overlapping strata/shapefile issues, and failure to perform required QA/QC remeasurement—each can materially affect quantified removals (monitoring report, 2025-06-28).
- Leakage is shown as a 0% deduction while leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2025-06-28 vs 2023-10-11).
- Buffer pool contribution is inconsistent between documents (10% in monitoring report vs 24% in validation report), creating uncertainty about permanence risk management.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB and an additionality test is described (monitoring report; PDD).

- Multiple CARs and corrective actions relate to baseline applicability, area delineation, QA/QC sampling, and missing uncertainty calculation, which can undermine quantified removals (monitoring report, 2025-06-28).

Additionality is presented as barrier-based and confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report; PDD). However, the monitoring report (2025-06-28) lists corrective actions including an outdated non-permanence risk report, a reduction in planted/project area due to resort construction requiring justification for methodology applicability and baseline appropriateness, overlapping strata/shapefile errors, failure to conduct required QA/QC remeasurement, and a missing uncertainty calculation. A buffer contribution is reported, but permanence confidence is reduced by inconsistent buffer percentages across documents and the note that carbon stocks declined by 2.19% across 2018–2021 (monitoring report).

### Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated and the extracted record shows claimed and verified ERs matching for the period (monitoring report, 2025-06-28).

- Key elements are inconsistent across documents (e.g., leakage treatment, safeguards/FPIC, buffer pool), reducing confidence in reported figures (multiple documents listed in contradictions).

The monitoring period is clearly defined (2022-06-15 to 2023-12-31) and the extracted record shows the same total ERs claimed and verified (60,226) for the cited record (monitoring report, 2025-06-28). Transparency is weakened by missing baseline reassessment timing and missing monitoring-method details in the extracted record, plus multiple cross-document inconsistencies (e.g., leakage treatment and safeguards). The number of documents used is high and extraction confidence is high, but contradictions reduce interpretability for external reviewers.

### Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ No discrepancy between claimed and verified ERs is shown in the extracted record for the cited monitoring period (monitoring report, 2025-06-28).

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and contradictions in safeguards/leakage/buffer increase greenwashing and over-crediting risk.

Over-crediting risk is elevated because the monitoring report (2025-06-28) flags issues that can directly affect quantified removals (area overlaps, QA/QC not performed, and no uncertainty calculation). Leakage is shown as a 0% deduction while the leakage justification is inconsistent across monitoring reports, which increases the risk that leakage is understated. CCP status and CORSIA eligibility are not stated in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess eligibility-based claim risk.

## Documentation — 6.3 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was used (36) including PDD, monitoring, validation, and issuance records, with high extraction confidence.

- Presence of an “unknown” source in the evidence set and multiple contradictions across documents indicate record-management and consistency issues.

The extracted record indicates 36 documents were used and includes core document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance), with high extraction confidence. Documentation quality is nonetheless impacted by the presence of an “unknown” document type and several contradictions across documents on safeguards, leakage, buffer pool, and ER totals. Corrective actions in the monitoring report (2025-06-28) also indicate that some required supporting analyses (e.g., updated non-permanence risk report, uncertainty calculation) were not current or not completed at the time of reporting.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Buffer stated but inconsistent; minor stock loss noted
● <b>Leakage</b>	0% deduction with inconsistent/weak justification
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance reported, but contradicted elsewhere
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Resolve CARs with documented evidence: updated non-permanence risk report, corrected strata/shapefiles, demonstrated QA/QC remeasurement, and a complete uncertainty calculation (monitoring report, 2025-06-28).

→ Publish a consistent leakage assessment (and any deduction) aligned across monitoring reports, and clarify the definitive buffer pool percentage with registry-consistent documentation.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Non-permanence risk report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Registration Representation
- AFOLU Project Element
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report
- Validation 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-D10828C7 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)