

## QUALITY REPORT

# Bamboo plantations by farmers and community in the country

VCS-3570 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-DD31C9B4 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

<b>5.2</b> Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.2</b>
	■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.8</b>
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.1</b>
	■ Documentation (15%)	<b>4.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a buffer pool of 19%, and no reported reversal events in the verification report. However, leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, and the low extraction confidence reduces trust in the documentation. Overall, this looks like a moderate-quality file with meaningful evidence gaps rather than a high-confidence low-risk crediting case.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3570
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0003 v2.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2049
VVB	Carbon Check
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: one source said it was deemed negligible, while the verification report records it as not addressed; I privileged the later verification report because it is the higher-priority and more recent document.
- Reversal risk is not fully resolved in the record: the verification report says no reversal events were reported, but an earlier document apparently left reversals not addressed, which lowers confidence in permanence-related claims.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test, which supports the project's core crediting case.

- Leakage is not addressed in the verification report, and the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly reassessed or standardized.

The verification report confirms additionality through a barrier test and says the VVB, Carbon Check, found no material findings. The project also has a 19% buffer pool and reports no reversal events, which is supportive for permanence. That said, leakage is recorded as not addressed in the verification report, and the baseline is project-specific with no reassessment date found, which weakens the overall integrity case.

### Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the verification report identifies Carbon Check as the VVB with no material findings reported.

- Key quantified fields are missing from the extracted record, including verified and claimed ERR totals, usage monitoring details, and leakage deduction.

The monitoring period and verification date are clearly stated, and the report identifies the verifier. However, the extracted record does not provide verified or claimed ERR totals, usage monitoring method, or leakage deduction, so the MRV trail is incomplete. The low extraction confidence further reduces transparency because at least one key document was poorly readable.

### Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

+ The project uses a recognized VCS methodology and has a 19% buffer pool, which helps reduce some crediting risk.

- Leakage justification is weak in the final verification record, and CORSIA eligibility is not stated, leaving residual claim-risk uncertainty.

The project is under VCS and uses AR-ACM0003, which is a recognized framework, but claim safety depends on how well emissions reductions are quantified and defended. Here, leakage is not addressed in the final verification record, and CORSIA eligibility is not stated, so the risk of overstated claims remains moderate. The 19% buffer pool helps, but it does not fully offset the uncertainty created by missing quantification fields.

### Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ The record includes a verification report date, a monitoring period, and multiple safeguard-related elements such as FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing.

- Extraction confidence is low and only one evidence document is clearly identified, which limits confidence in completeness and consistency.

The file contains a verification report with a recent date, a long monitoring period, and several safeguard indicators such as FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing. Even so, only one evidence document is clearly identified in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is low. With no corrective actions reported, the documentation is usable but not robust enough for a high-confidence assessment.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● <b>Permanence</b>	buffer pool present, no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	leakage not addressed in final report
● <b>Baseline</b>	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear leakage assessment in the verification or monitoring report, including any deduction or justification for why leakage is negligible.

→ Publish the verified and claimed ERR totals, usage monitoring method, and a clearer document set so the emissions accounting can be independently checked.

## Documents Reviewed

- VCS\_RV1\_PRR\_3570\_11DEC2025.pdf
- Issuance-Representation-Single-PP-v4.3-3570.pdf
- VCS PDMR 3570 09JUL2019-16DEC2024\_round1\_clean docx.pdf
- MP Bamboo Plantations.kml
- Ex post 3570 20062025.xlsx
- EX ante 3570 PAI-1 20062025.xlsx
- Registration-Representation-Single-PP-v4.4-FINAL-3570.pdf
- EX ante 3570 Grouped 20062025.xlsx
- VCS-Listing-Representation.pdf
- VCS\_NPR\_REP\_3570\_7\_9\_2019\_12\_16\_2024.pdf
- PAI-1 KML File 3570.kml
- VCS PD.pdf
- CCIPL 2645- Verification-Representation-v4.2.pdf
- CCIPL 2645- Validation-Representation-v4.2.pdf
- VCS ValVerR 3570 09Jul2019 -16Dec2024 PRR\_Clean.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-DD31C9B4 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)