QUALITY REPORT

Improving livelihoods through Agroforestry Plantations in India

VCS-3560 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-13F461CF · Generated: 2026-04-20 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.0
	Transparency (25%)	4.7
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, no material findings, and a quantified leakage treatment. However, key permanence and documentation elements are weak or missing, and the record contains several contradictions across documents that reduce confidence. Overall, this looks like a moderate-quality project with meaningful evidence gaps rather than a high-confidence crediting case.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3560
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0003 Version 02.0
Crediting Period	2018 — 2048
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-20

Red Flags

- ■ The record does not state a buffer pool, and reversal handling is not clearly addressed despite a long crediting period.
- ■ Several contradictions exist across documents on safeguards, grievance mechanisms, FPIC, leakage treatment, and crediting period timing.
- ■ Extraction confidence is low and the evidence list is not specific, which weakens documentation reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.0 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the verification report reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Permanence is only partially supported: reversal events are marked as not addressed, and no buffer pool percentage is stated.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB found no material findings or corrective actions. That supports the project, but permanence is weaker because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is stated. Leakage is at least acknowledged as quantified, which is better than silence, but the underlying deduction amount is not available in the extracted record.

Transparency — 4.7 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the verification report identifies Carbon Check (India) Private Limited as the VVB.

- Key MRV details are missing, including claimed versus verified ER totals, usage monitoring method, and any public registry completeness indicators.

Transparency is limited by missing core MRV fields: the record does not state claimed versus verified ER totals, the usage monitoring method, or any registry completeness details. The monitoring period is clearly identified, and the VVB is named as Carbon Check (India) Private Limited, which helps, but the low extraction confidence reduces trust in completeness. The absence of quantified public-facing reporting elements keeps this below a strong transparency score.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.

- Baseline and leakage evidence are incomplete: the baseline is project-specific, leakage is only described as quantified without a percentage, and FNRB is not applicable rather than clearly benchmarked.

Claim safety is mixed. The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-claim risk, but the baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed jurisdictional baseline. Leakage is only described as quantified, without a percentage or supporting detail, and the FNRB field is marked not applicable rather than providing a benchmark against national defaults.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ The record includes a verification report with ten extracted facts and no corrective actions required.

- Extraction confidence is low, the evidence documents are not clearly enumerated, and multiple contradictions indicate uneven document quality.

Documentation quality is moderate but not strong. The record includes a verification report and no corrective actions, yet the evidence list is not specific and the extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was difficult to read. The long crediting period is stated, but the contradictions across documents and missing supporting details reduce confidence in the completeness of the file.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
Permanence	No buffer pool stated
Leakage	Quantified but not quantified in record
Baseline	Project baseline only
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism stated
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the full verification and monitoring evidence with quantified ER totals, leakage deduction, and usage monitoring details.

→ Document permanence safeguards clearly, including buffer pool treatment or an explicit rationale for why reversal risk is not material.

Documents Reviewed

- VCS_PRR_3560_06JAN2026.pdf
- VCS PDMR 3560 01MAR2018-30SEP2024_round2_clean.pdf
- ER Ex ante 4000 ha.xlsx
- ER Ex post PAI-1.xlsx
- VCS_NPR_REP_3560_3_1_2023_9_30_2024 (1).pdf
- Dhar KML .kml
- VCS-Joint-Project-Description-Monitoring-Report-Template-v4.2.pdf
- VCS-Listing-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1 (1).pdf
- CCIPL 2477_Verification-Representation-v4.2.pdf
- CCIPL 2477_Validation-Representation-v4.2.pdf
- VCS ValVerR 3560_01Mar2018-30Sep2024_round 2_CC (1).pdf

Report ID: CM-13F461CF · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-20 · Generated: 2026-04-20

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