

QUALITY REPORT

Reforestation Of Degraded Land By MTPL In India

VCS-2404 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-F9F157B6 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.5

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

Assessment Summary

Moderate integrity and documentation: additionality was confirmed by a VVB and multiple documents exist, but key baseline details and buffer treatment are missing and there are contradictions between the monitoring and validation reports on safeguards and community consent. Large discrepancy between claimed and verified removals raises over-crediting concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2404
Sector	arr
Country	India
Vintage	2001-2011
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0001 04
Crediting Period	2001 — 2031
VVB	KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	1,764,076 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2001 — 2011
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Large discrepancy between claimed (4,210,087 tCO₂e) and verified removals (1,764,076 tCO₂e)
- Contradictory statements on safeguards, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, and FPIC between monitoring report (2013-06-17) and validation report (2013-06-27)
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

- + additionality confirmed by the VVB (KBS Certification Services) as shown in the verification/monitoring documents
- no baseline method or buffer pool percentage stated and leakage deduction not specified despite only a 'deemed negligible' justification

Additionality was assessed using a combined test and confirmed by the project VVB (KBS Certification Services) as documented in the verification/monitoring materials. However, key permanence and baseline controls are weakly documented: no buffer pool percentage is stated, baseline method and reassessment date are not found in the extracted record, and leakage is only described as 'deemed negligible' without any leakage deduction percentage. No reversal events or material findings were reported, but the absence of quantified buffer treatment and baseline details lowers integrity.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

- + monitoring period (2001-06-25 to 2011-06-24), VVB name, registry (CDM), and verified issuance (1,764,076) are present in the monitoring report
- baseline method, baseline reassessment date and buffer pool percentage are not stated in available documents

The monitoring report provides monitoring period (2001-06-25 to 2011-06-24), VVB name, registry (CDM) and the verified total removals (1,764,076), which supports transparency. Nevertheless, several important fields are missing from the public record: baseline methodology is not stated, grid emission factor and buffer pool percentage are absent, and usage monitoring details are not provided. Extraction confidence is high and many documents are present, but gaps in baseline and leakage disclosure reduce the transparency score.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- + project is reported as not CORSIA-eligible (reduces one double-claim pathway)
- large over-claiming signal: claimed 4,210,087 tCO₂e vs verified 1,764,076 tCO₂e; leakage justification is qualitative ('deemed negligible') with no quantified deduction

There is a significant discrepancy between total removals claimed (4,210,087 tCO₂e) and total removals verified (1,764,076 tCO₂e), which is a red flag for over-claiming or inconsistent accounting. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-claim risk, but CCP status is not stated. Leakage is justified as negligible in the monitoring report but no quantitative deduction is documented. Together these points imply elevated risk of overstated claims.

Documentation — 6.5 / 10

- + multiple evidence documents listed (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and 17 documents used; extraction confidence is high
- direct contradictions between monitoring report (2013-06-17) and validation report (2013-06-27) on safeguards, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing and FPIC reduce trust in the record

Documentation coverage is reasonably good: multiple core documents are listed (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance), 17 documents were used, and extraction confidence is high. The VVB is named. However, the validation report (dated 2013-06-27) contradicts the monitoring report (dated 2013-06-17) on safeguards, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing and FPIC. Those contradictions reduce confidence in the consistency and reliability of the documentation even though no material findings or corrective actions were recorded.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	buffer/baseline unclear
● Leakage	declared negligible but unquantified
● Baseline	baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	inconsistent documentation
● Double-claim	CORSIA no / CCP unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish and cite the baseline methodology and date of last reassessment, including any jurisdictional baselines used

→ Resolve contradictions by providing a reconciled validation/monitoring addendum clarifying safeguards, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing and FPIC, and disclose buffer pool percentage and any leakage deductions

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- mosaic_all.kml
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Listing Representation
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- 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-F9F157B6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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