QUALITY REPORT

Fertile Ground

CE-fertile-ground · Verra · India

Report ID: CM-47ED25B0 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ **Integrity (35%)**	**3.6**
	■ **Transparency (25%)**	**3.2**
	■ **Claim Safety (25%)**	**3.4**
	■ **Documentation (15%)**	**4.1**

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the single available PDD extract, the project's core integrity and MRV details are not sufficiently evidenced to support high confidence in credit quality. Additionality is described as a barrier test and safeguards are mentioned, but key quantifications (baseline reassessment, leakage, reversals/buffer, monitoring results) are not found in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra
Registry ID	CE-fertile-ground
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	VM0042 2.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2037
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Only one document (a PDD) was available in the extracted record; no monitoring or verification results were found (no verified ERs, monitoring period, or VVB identified).
- Soil carbon project with no buffer pool percentage, reversal risk treatment, or reversal event reporting found in the extracted record.
- Leakage treatment is not found in the extracted record (no leakage deduction or justification).

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.6 / 10

+ The PDD (2022) states additionality is assessed using a barrier test.

- Baseline is project-specific and key integrity elements (baseline reassessment timing, leakage, and permanence/buffer approach) are not found in the extracted record.

The PDD (2022) indicates additionality is assessed via a barrier test, but it is not confirmed by a VVB in the extracted record. The baseline approach is project-specific, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents. For a soil carbon project, permanence management is not evidenced here: no buffer pool percentage, reversal risk treatment, or reversal event reporting is found in the extracted record, and leakage deduction/justification is also not found.

Transparency — 3.2 / 10

+ The extracted record indicates no material findings or corrective actions (from the available PDD extract).

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or claimed vs verified emission reductions are found in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record contains only a PDD (2022) and does not include a monitoring period, any claimed or verified emission reductions, or the name of the validating/verifying body. While the extracted record shows no material findings and no corrective actions, this appears to reflect the absence of verification documentation rather than a confirmed clean audit trail. Public-facing MRV specifics (e.g., how outcomes are monitored and reported over time) are not found in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 3.4 / 10

~ Safeguards are mentioned in the PDD (2022), but FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing details are not found in the extracted record.

- No evidence of verified results or eligibility status (CORSIA/CCP) is found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting and claims risk.

Claims risk is elevated because there is no verified ER figure, no monitoring period, and no VVB information found in the extracted record, making it hard to assess over-crediting risk. Safeguards are mentioned in the PDD (2022), but FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing details are not found in the extracted record, which increases reputational/greenwashing risk for buyer claims. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, leaving uncertainty around how the credits might be marketed and perceived.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ Extraction confidence is high for the available document.

- Documentation set appears incomplete (only one document listed as "unknown"; no monitoring/verification reports found).

Documentation quality is constrained by coverage: only one document (a PDD dated 2022-02-04) is reflected, with the evidence document listed as "unknown" and no monitoring or verification reports found. The extraction confidence is high, which supports reliability of what was captured, but the absence of key document types limits completeness. No corrective actions are listed, but without VVB reports this does not strongly evidence audit outcomes.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Barrier test stated; not VVB-confirmed in extracted record
Permanence	Soil carbon reversal management not evidenced (no buffer/reversal details found)
Leakage	Leakage deduction and justification not found in extracted record
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned; FPIC/grievance/benefit sharing not evidenced
Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated in available documents

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the validation/verification reports and monitoring reports showing the monitoring period, VVB name, and claimed vs verified emission reductions.

→ Disclose permanence risk management for soil carbon (buffer pool contribution, reversal monitoring/response procedures) and provide leakage quantification or a justified leakage deduction.

Documents Reviewed

• North India Project PDD

Report ID: CM-47ED25B0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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