

QUALITY REPORT

Sustainable agricultural practices for carbon sequestration by Organic and Natural farming groups

VCS-3115 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-FDB06E99 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.1
■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	3.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a negligible leakage justification, but the evidence base is weakened by a low extraction-confidence record, unresolved permanence ambiguity, and a large gap between claimed and verified ERs. Transparency is limited by missing monitoring details and a single readable evidence source, while the verification report shows multiple corrective actions and one methodological deviation that was accepted. Overall, this looks like a moderately documented project with meaningful reliability and over-crediting concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3115
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VM0017 v1.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2047
VVB	EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	1,107,315 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2021
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	16 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- Verified emissions reductions are far below the amount claimed, with 1,107,315 verified versus 22,527,745 claimed.
- The record says reversal events were not addressed in one place, while another document says none were reported, creating a permanence reliability issue.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the verification report cites a common-practice test.

- The verification report shows 13 CARs, 10 CLs, one FAR, and a methodological deviation, which weakens confidence in the project controls.

The verification report confirms additionality through a common-practice test and says the VVB accepted the project's approach. However, the report also lists 13 corrective action requests, 10 clarification requests, one forward action request, and a methodological deviation that was deemed acceptable, which suggests control weaknesses and some reliance on reviewer judgment. Leakage is treated as negligible, but permanence is less robust because reversal handling is inconsistent across the extracted record.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The monitoring period and crediting period are clearly stated, and the VVB is named in the verification report.

- Key MRV details are missing or not stated in available documents, including the monitoring method, leakage deduction, and usage monitoring.

The project's monitoring period and crediting period are clearly identified, and the VVB is named as EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited. That said, several core MRV fields are not stated in available documents, including the monitoring method and any verified usage-rate information, and the evidence set is thin. The low extraction confidence further reduces transparency because at least one key source was poorly readable.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ Leakage is described as negligible, which is better than an unquantified or ignored leakage treatment.

- The gap between claimed and verified ERs is very large, which raises over-crediting risk and claim reliability concerns.

Claim safety is weakened by the very large difference between claimed and verified ERs: 22,527,745 claimed versus 1,107,315 verified. The project type is soil carbon under VM0017, and leakage is described as negligible, which helps, but the absence of quantified leakage deductions and missing usage-monitoring detail leave residual over-crediting risk. Because CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 3.4 / 10

+ The verification report is recent and identifies the VVB, with 14 documents used in extraction.

- Extraction confidence is low, and the record includes only one evidence document entry marked unknown, limiting auditability.

Documentation quality is mixed. The verification report is dated 2025-09-26 and the project has 14 documents used in extraction, but the extraction confidence is low and the evidence-doc list is not informative. The presence of multiple CARs and a FAR also indicates that the documentation required substantial follow-up before acceptance.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed test
● Permanence	reversal handling inconsistent
● Leakage	negligible but not quantified
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete monitoring package with quantified leakage treatment, usage monitoring, and the full basis for the verified emissions reductions.

→ Resolve the reversal and additionality contradictions in a single reconciled statement and provide clearer evidence of baseline reassessment and registry status.

Documents Reviewed

- VCS_RV_PRR_3115_26SEP2025.pdf
- ISS_DEED_REP_3115_290922.pdf
- 3115_PD-MR_V 1.7 Clean (1).pdf
- 3115_Ex_Ante_Ex_Post_Sheet (1) (1).xlsx
- Project_area.kml
- 3115_NPR_V 1.7 VERRA RESUB_Clean (1).pdf
- Project Boundary.kml
- VCS_RV_EXEMPTION-APPROVED_3115_28MAR2024.pdf
- VCS-LRMR Vedic KMS.pdf
- Communications-Agreement-3115- rev 1.pdf
- VERRA registry communication agreement.pdf
- REG_DEED_REP_3115_29092022.pdf
- PROJ_DESC_DRAFT_3115_18042022.pdf
- VCS-VER_REP_3115_29092022.pdf
- VCS-VAL_REP_3115_29092022.pdf
- Val Ver Report 3115 ver 1. 5 Clean (1).pdf

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-FDB06E99 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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