

QUALITY REPORT

Agroforestry plantations in India

VCS-3562 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-425710E1 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some integrity positives, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a buffer pool of 19%, and no reported reversals during the monitoring period. However, leakage is not addressed in the latest verification record, the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly reassessed, and the record contains several contradictions that reduce confidence. Documentation quality is weakened by low extraction confidence and 43 corrective actions raised during validation.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3562
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0003 v2.0
Crediting Period	2018 — 2048
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the latest verification report, despite a prior document indicating it was quantified.
- There are multiple contradictions across documents on additionality, FPIC, safeguards, benefit sharing, grievance mechanism, and reversal treatment.
- Forty-three corrective actions were raised during validation, suggesting material documentation or implementation issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a common-practice test under the cited methodology.
- Leakage is not addressed in the latest verification report, and the baseline is described as project-based with no reassessment date stated.

The verification report confirms additionality through a common-practice test and says the VVB verified it, which supports the project's core crediting logic. A 19% buffer pool and no reported reversal events during the monitoring period are positive for permanence, but the latest report says leakage is not addressed and the baseline is project-based, which weakens robustness. The absence of a baseline reassessment date and the presence of 43 corrective actions raised during validation further reduce confidence in the integrity package.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The monitoring period and crediting period are stated, and the verification report names the VVB.
- Total verified and claimed emission reductions are not stated, and the extraction confidence is low, limiting document reliability.

The record provides the monitoring period, crediting period, and VVB name, which helps traceability. However, the extracted facts do not state total claimed or verified emission reductions, and the usage monitoring method is not found in the available documents. Low extraction confidence also suggests at least one key source was hard to read, so the transparency score is held down.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

- + The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces dual-market claim risk.
- Leakage treatment is unclear because the latest report says it is not addressed, while an earlier document reportedly quantified it.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of overlapping international claims. Still, the latest verification report says leakage is not addressed, while an earlier document reportedly quantified it, creating uncertainty about over-crediting risk. The project's project-specific baseline and missing quantified usage data also limit confidence in the conservativeness of the claims.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

- + Thirteen documents were used, and the verification report is dated 2025-12-03, which is relatively recent.
- Low extraction confidence and 43 corrective actions raised during validation indicate incomplete or difficult-to-verify documentation.

Documentation is only moderate because 13 documents were used and the verification report is recent, but the extracted record shows low extraction confidence. The project also has 43 corrective actions raised during validation, which suggests the documentation or implementation required substantial follow-up. Several safeguard-related items are contradicted across documents, so the record is not fully stable or complete.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed test
● Permanence	buffer present, no reversals reported
● Leakage	leakage not addressed in latest report
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present, but contradictions rem
● Double-claim	not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment in the latest verification and reconcile it with the earlier document that reportedly quantified leakage.

→ Publish a consolidated evidence pack that resolves contradictions on FPIC, safeguards, benefit sharing, grievance mechanism, and reversal treatment, with readable source excerpts.

Documents Reviewed

- VCS Issuance Deed of Representation.pdf
- VCS_RV_PRR_3562_03DEC2025.pdf
- RD3_VCS PDMR 3562 18JUNE2018-17MARCH2024_5.3 Clean.pdf
- VCS Registration Deed of Representation.pdf
- Ex ante ER 3562 (PAI-1).xlsx
- Declaration of Agency and Communications Agreement.pdf
- Ex Post ER 3562 .xlsx
- Listing agreement.pdf
- PAI-1 KML.kml
- VCS_NPR_REP_3562_6_18_2018_3_17_2024.pdf
- PDMR.pdf
- RD3_VVR_3562_v1.3_4KES Clean.pdf
- 3562- Verification-Representation-v4.2.pdf
- 3562 - Validation-Representation-v4.2.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-425710E1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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