

## QUALITY REPORT

# Urunday Afforestation Project

CMARK-3 · CMARK · Argentina

Report ID: CM-696FF8D4 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.3**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.4</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>3.2</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.6</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>2.8</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This afforestation removal project shows some core integrity elements (VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated 10% buffer) but has notable evidence gaps on leakage quantification, baseline reassessment timing, and monitoring-period specifics. Multiple cross-document inconsistencies and low extraction confidence reduce confidence in the reliability and completeness of the record.

## Project Details

Registry	CMARK
Registry ID	CMARK-3
Sector	arr
Country	Argentina
Vintage	2025
Project Methodology	Metodología para la verificación de créditos de carbono – Facultad de Ingeniería UNLP 1.0
Crediting Period	2016 — 2046
VVB	Nullaexitus
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Leakage is only described as “negligible” with no quantified leakage deduction found in the extracted record.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.
- Key MRV fields (monitoring period and verified vs claimed removals) are not found in the extracted record.
- Contradictions across documents on safeguards, leakage treatment, reversal discussion, and the type of additionality test used.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ The validation/verification documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and a 10% buffer pool is specified.

- Leakage is treated as negligible without a stated leakage deduction percentage, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents.

The validation report (2025-07-17) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project applies a 10% buffer pool, which supports permanence risk management for an ARR removal activity. However, the baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens baseline robustness. Leakage is described as negligible in the validation report, but no leakage deduction percentage is found in the extracted record, leaving leakage treatment only partially substantiated.

### Transparency — 3.2 / 10

+ A named VVB is provided and the most recent document date is recent (2025-07-17).

- Monitoring period and claimed vs verified removals are not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

The extracted record identifies the VVB (Nullaexitus) and includes a recent verification report date (2025-07-17), which helps traceability. Still, the monitoring period is not found in the extracted record, and neither claimed nor verified total removals are available, preventing a basic reconciliation of issuance quantities. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that all relevant MRV details were captured.

### Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ No reversal events are reported in the validation report, and a buffer contribution is stated.

- CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in available documents and leakage/baseline quantification gaps increase over-crediting risk.

Over-crediting risk is elevated because leakage is only asserted as negligible (validation report, 2025-07-17) without a quantified deduction, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so downstream claim-channel risk cannot be screened out. While no reversals are reported (validation report, 2025-07-17) and a buffer is specified, the lack of verified vs claimed totals limits confidence in the accuracy of credited removals.

### Documentation — 2.8 / 10

+ Multiple document types are referenced (PDD and validation report) and no material findings/corrective actions are reported in the verification report.

- Minimum extraction confidence is low and several key fields are missing or contradicted across documents.

The evidence set includes a PDD and a validation report, and the verification report indicates no material findings and no corrective actions required, which would normally support documentation quality. However, minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key document was poorly readable, and several critical fields (monitoring period, claimed/verified totals, leakage deduction) are not found in the extracted record. Multiple contradictions between documents also indicate record inconsistency and reduce documentation reliability.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	10% buffer; no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Negligible claimed; deduction not quantified
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance noted, but inconsistent records
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/confirm the monitoring period(s) and provide a clear table reconciling claimed vs verified removals for each issuance vintage in the verification/monitoring documentation.

→ Quantify leakage (or justify a 0% deduction with activity data and boundary analysis) and document when/how the baseline was last reassessed.

## Documents Reviewed

- UNLP Academic Leadership for Regional Sustainability
- Urunday Wildlife Survey Report
- Urunday Project: A Beacon of ESG Value in Argentine Mesopotamia
- TRANSFER CERTIFICATE FOR VERIFIED CARBON UNITS (VCU)
- CARBON CREDITS DEVELOPMENT AND COMMERCIALIZATION AGREEMENT
- AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREST PLANTATIONS AND SILVICULTURAL ACTIVITIES
- URUNDAY AFFORESTATION PROJECT PDD
- METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE ELABORATION OF AFFORESTATION AND REFORESTATION PROJECTS
- Urunday Forestation Project - TECHNICAL VERIFICATION REPORT

### 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-696FF8D4 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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