QUALITY REPORT

Buriram Rubber Plantation Carbon Sequestration & GHG Emission Reduction Project

CMARK-4 · CMARK · Thailand

Report ID: CM-3DCAE562 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	4.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
	Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some integrity strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality via a barrier test and documented safeguards elements (FPIC and a grievance mechanism). However, key quantifications needed to judge crediting conservativeness—especially verified ERs, leakage deduction percentage, and permanence risk management (buffer/reversal treatment)—were not found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	CMARK
Registry ID	CMARK-4
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Thailand
Vintage	2022
Project Methodology	ETM Carbon Trade By ETM Group Co., Ltd.
Crediting Period	2016 — 2022
VVB	ETM Group
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Verified emission reductions were not found in the extracted record, despite a claimed total of 60,052.86 tCO_2e.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage was not found in the extracted record.
- Permanence risk management is unclear: no buffer pool percentage and no reversal-event reporting were found in the extracted record for a sequestration-focused project.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation report confirms additionality using a barrier test and VVB confirmation.

- Permanence and leakage quantification are incomplete in the extracted record (no buffer contribution stated; leakage percentage not stated).

The validation report (2025) indicates additionality was assessed using a barrier test and confirmed by the VVB. Baseline setting appears project-specific (project baseline), and the timing of any baseline reassessment was not found in the extracted record. For a soil/biomass sequestration-type activity, permanence risk management is not evidenced in the extracted record because no buffer pool contribution and no reversal-event reporting were found. Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage was not found, limiting confidence in net credited ERs.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ Monitoring and crediting periods are clearly stated as 2016-01-01 to 2022-12-31 in the validation report.

- The extracted record does not include verified ER totals or an ER claim-versus-verification comparison.

The validation report provides clear crediting and monitoring dates (2016-01-01 to 2022-12-31). However, the extracted record does not include a verified ER total, so the claimed 60,052.86 tCO2e cannot be cross-checked against verification outcomes. The registry is listed as “other,” and CORSIA eligibility was not found in the extracted record, reducing clarity for buyers. Overall MRV transparency is constrained by missing quantified outputs (verified ERs and leakage deduction).

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

+ Safeguards elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are described in the extracted documents.

- CORSIA and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, and key conservativeness checks (verified ERs, leakage deduction) are missing.

Claims risk is elevated because the extracted record contains a claimed ER total but no verified ER total, preventing a basic over-crediting check. Leakage is said to be quantified, yet the leakage deduction percentage is not available in the extracted record, which can materially affect net climate benefit claims. CCP status and CORSIA eligibility were not found, so buyers cannot easily position the credits against higher-integrity eligibility screens. Safeguards elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are present, which helps reduce reputational risk but does not resolve quantification gaps.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are referenced (validation report and PDD) with a recent validation date (2025-08-09).

- At least one source is listed as an unknown document type and extraction confidence is only medium, leaving important gaps.

Documentation coverage is moderate: the evidence list includes a validation report and a PDD, and the validation report is recent (2025-08-09). The extracted record also references an unknown document type, and minimum extraction confidence is medium, suggesting some information may be missing or hard to extract. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the validation report, but the absence of a verification report in the extracted record limits completeness for issued/verified outcomes. Overall, documentation is adequate for project description and safeguards, but incomplete for quantified performance and risk controls.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Barrier test confirmed by VVB
Permanence	Buffer/reversal treatment not evidenced
Leakage	Quantified in narrative, % deduction missing
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verification report (or equivalent) stating the verified ER total for 2016–2022 and any adjustments from the claimed amount.

→ Disclose quantified leakage results, including the leakage deduction percentage and justification calculations, and document permanence risk management (buffer pool contribution and reversal monitoring/response procedures).

Documents Reviewed

- Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)
- Project Design Document: PDD
- Monitoring Report (Translated)
- ETM-014-Validation-Report
- ETM-017-Monitoring-Report-BRLS
- Validation Report (Translated)

Report ID: CM-3DCAE562 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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