

QUALITY REPORT

India Sundarbans Mangrove Restoration

VCS-1463 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-6E238124 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.1Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	7.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows several integrity positives typical of VCS ARR/REDD-style AFOLU work: additionality is confirmed by the VVB, a buffer contribution is stated, and no reversals are reported in the latest monitoring record. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (notably in verified ERs, buffer percentage, crediting period, and leakage treatment) raise reliability and over-crediting/claims risk and reduce confidence in the extracted figures.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1463
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AR-AM0014 3.01
Crediting Period	2010 — 2030
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Verified ERs	399,773 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Large discrepancy in verified emission reductions between documents (399,773 vs ~88,331), creating over-crediting/claims risk.
- Buffer pool contribution is inconsistent across monitoring reports (10% vs 15%).
- Crediting period dates conflict between monitoring and validation documents.
- Leakage treatment shifts from “deemed negligible” to “quantified” while a 0% leakage deduction is reported.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2022) reports no reversal events and states a 10% buffer contribution.

- Integrity-relevant parameters conflict across documents (buffer %, leakage approach, crediting period), reducing confidence in baseline/permanence controls.

Additionality is confirmed by the VVB, with the monitoring report (2022) describing a combined additionality approach, which is stronger than an unverified narrative. Permanence controls appear present: the monitoring report (2022) reports no reversal events and states a 10% buffer contribution, but the buffer percentage conflicts with an earlier monitoring report (2015) that states 15%, reducing confidence in the permanence risk management. Leakage is reported with a 0% deduction alongside a “quantified” justification in the monitoring report (2022), but an earlier monitoring report (2018) describes leakage as “deemed negligible,” which weakens confidence that leakage has been treated consistently over time.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ A named VVB (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH) and a clearly stated monitoring period (2018-04-01 to 2021-04-30) support auditability.

- Key public-facing claim numbers are inconsistent across validation documents (verified ERs), undermining MRV clarity.

The project has a clearly identified VVB (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH) and a defined monitoring period (2018-04-01 to 2021-04-30) in the monitoring report (2022), which supports traceability. However, the extracted record shows a major inconsistency in verified ER totals between validation documents (2015 vs 2023), which makes it difficult for third parties to reconcile what was actually verified versus claimed. Several MRV-related fields (e.g., usage monitoring method, usage rate verified/assumed) are not found in the extracted record, limiting transparency on operational monitoring details.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB and safeguards elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism) are documented in the extracted record.

- Contradictory ER totals and shifting leakage justification increase greenwashing/over-crediting risk; CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in the extracted record.

Over-crediting/claims risk is elevated because the extracted record contains conflicting verified ER totals across validation reports (2015 vs 2023), and the monitoring report (2022) also shows a mismatch between claimed and verified totals in the extracted fields. Leakage treatment is also inconsistent across monitoring reports (2018 vs 2022), while the leakage deduction remains 0%, which increases the risk that buyers could overstate climate impact if leakage was not robustly handled. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on those labels to reduce double-claim or quality-screening risk.

Documentation — 7.2 / 10

+ The extracted record indicates broad document coverage (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 16 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Multiple corrective action requests (CAR 01–CAR 06) indicate documentation/control weaknesses during audit.

Documentation coverage appears relatively strong: the extracted record lists PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance evidence, with 16 documents used and high extraction confidence. That said, the monitoring record indicates multiple corrective action requests (CAR 01–CAR 06), suggesting that auditors found issues requiring remediation. Some important fields (e.g., baseline reassessment timing) are not found in the extracted record, which reduces completeness for assessing ongoing baseline validity.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Buffer stated but inconsistent across years
● Leakage	0% deduction with inconsistent justification
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not found
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciliation table across validation/verification/issuance showing claimed vs verified ERs by monitoring period and explaining the 2015 vs 2023 verified-ER discrepancy.

→ Clarify and document the buffer pool contribution basis and any changes over time (e.g., risk rating updates), and align leakage treatment (quantified vs negligible) with a consistent, auditable calculation narrative.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Non-permanence risk report
- Registration Representation
- Listing Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Verification 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-6E238124 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy