QUALITY REPORT

GROUPED AGROFORESTRY PROJECT IN VARIOUS STATES OF INDIA

VCS-3572 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-9EEBB6BE · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.4
	Transparency (25%)	4.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
	Documentation (15%)	3.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a 20% buffer pool, and no reported material findings. However, key evidence gaps remain around leakage treatment, reversal handling, and several monitoring details, which limits confidence in the claimed climate benefits. Documentation quality is weakened by low extraction confidence and unresolved contradictions between documents.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3572
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AR-ACM003 v2.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2049
VVB	Carbon Check
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2025
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: one record says it was quantified, while an earlier document described it as merely deemed negligible.
- ■ Reversal risk is not clearly addressed in the extracted record, despite a long crediting period and agroforestry permanence concerns.
- ■ Several core MRV fields are missing, including verified and claimed emission reductions, usage monitoring, and baseline reassessment timing.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a barrier test under the AR-ACM003 methodology.

- Reversal events are noted as not addressed in the extracted record, even though a non-permanence risk analysis is mentioned.

The verification report confirms additionality through a barrier test and says the VVB, Carbon Check, validated it. A 20% buffer pool is a positive permanence feature, but reversal events are still marked as not addressed, which is a meaningful weakness for an agroforestry project with long-term storage risk. Leakage is described as quantified in the latest record, but the contradiction with an earlier document that treated it as merely negligible reduces confidence in the robustness of the accounting.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The verification report identifies Carbon Check as the VVB and provides a clear monitoring period from 2019-07-01 to 2025-04-01.

- Claimed versus verified emission reductions are not stated, and usage monitoring details are missing from the available record.

The project has some transparency strengths because the verification report names the VVB and gives a clear monitoring period from 2019-07-01 to 2025-04-01. However, the extracted record does not state total claimed or verified emission reductions, and usage monitoring is not described. Baseline reassessment timing is also not found, which limits the ability to judge MRV completeness.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

+ The project has a 20% buffer pool and a quantified leakage treatment in the latest record.

- Baseline design is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a project baseline rather than a more conservative standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and the leakage treatment is not fully stable across documents. The record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted facts alone. The absence of verified emission reduction figures also leaves some over-crediting uncertainty.

Documentation — 3.8 / 10

+ The record includes a verification report date of 2026-03-06, a named VVB, and no material findings or corrective actions.

- Extraction confidence is low, only one evidence document is listed, and several key fields are not found in the available documents.

Documentation quality is limited by low extraction confidence and the fact that only one evidence document is listed in the extracted record. On the positive side, the verification report is recent, names the VVB, and reports no material findings or corrective actions. Still, several important fields are not found in the available documents, including leakage percentage, usage monitoring method, and verified emission totals.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● **Permanence**	buffer pool present, reversal handling unclear
● **Leakage**	quantified in latest record, but contradictory history
● **Baseline**	project baseline, reassessment timing not stated
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the full verification and monitoring evidence showing claimed versus verified emission reductions, leakage calculations, and usage monitoring methods.

→ Clarify reversal risk treatment, baseline reassessment timing, and the final resolved position on leakage and additionality across all project documents.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance deed (1).pdf
- VCS PDMR 3572 01JUL2019-1APR2025_Clean#2.pdf
- VCS_NPR_REP_ 1.pdf
- Ex Post VCS-3572 25092025.xlsx
- VCS-Listing-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1.pdf
- CHIP_Nagpur.kml
- Registration deed (1).pdf
- PAI 1 KML 3572 (3).kml
- EX ante PAI-1 VCS-3572 25092025.xlsx
- VCS_PRR_3572_06MARCH2026.pdf
- PDMR Group agroforestry.pdf
- VCS 3572 ValR Ver 01July2019-01April2025-CC.pdf
- CCIPL 2685_Verification-Representation-v4.2.pdf

Report ID: CM-9EEBB6BE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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