

## QUALITY REPORT

# Mixed afforestation with native and non-native species in Argentina-I

VCS-4763 · VCS · Argentina

Report ID: CM-DCC56F7B · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**6.2**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.2</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>6.5</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.5</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.8</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

Project shows a verified additionality test and named VVB, but key permanence and leakage treatments are missing or contradicted across documents. Documentation is reasonably complete and recent, but contradictions between the monitoring and validation reports reduce confidence and increase risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-4763
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Argentina
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0003 02.0
Crediting Period	2022 — 2062
VVB	AENOR
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

## Red Flags

- Contradictory evidence about safeguards, FPIC and grievance mechanism between monitoring and validation reports.
- Leakage treatment is contradictory (monitoring says negligible; later validation indicates not addressed) and buffer/reversal handling is not documented.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality confirmed by the VVB (AENOR) using an investment test, per the monitoring report (2025-10-31).

- No buffer pool percentage reported and reversal risk is not addressed in available documents; baseline reassessment timing not stated.

Additionality was confirmed by the independent verifier AENOR using an investment test as stated in the monitoring report (2025-10-31), which is a strong positive. However, the project uses a project-specific baseline (method AR-ACM0003) and there is no recorded baseline reassessment date. No buffer pool percentage is reported and reversal events are listed as not addressed, which weakens permanence and leakage safeguards. The absence of explicit leakage deductions and gaps on reversal handling reduce the integrity score.

### Transparency — 6.5 / 10

+ Named VVB (AENOR) and a recent monitoring period is provided (2022-09-01 — 2023-11-16); multiple documents (PDD, monitoring report, validation, issuance) are in the record.

- Key MRV numbers are missing from extracted records (verified vs claimed ERR, total ERR figures, usage monitoring method not stated).

Transparency is bolstered by a named VVB, a clear monitoring period (2022-09-01 — 2023-11-16), and multiple documents in the dossier (PDD, monitoring report, validation, issuance). Extraction confidence is high. Nevertheless, key MRV outputs — like claimed vs verified emission removal totals, usage monitoring method, and buffer percentage — are not found in the extracted record, limiting independent review.

### Claim Safety — 5.5 / 10

+ Project is marked not CORSIA-eligible (reduces one double-claim pathway) and uses a recognised VCS methodology (AR-ACM0003 v02.0).

- Baseline is project-specific and leakage justification is contradictory (monitoring: deemed negligible; validation: not addressed), increasing over-crediting risk.

The project is recorded as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers double-claim risk on one axis, and the methodology is standardised under VCS. But reliance on a project-specific baseline and contradictory or missing leakage treatment (monitoring says leakage is negligible while a validation record indicates leakage was not addressed) raises over-crediting concerns. CCP status is not stated, which leaves some dual-claim risk unresolved.

### Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Multiple evidence documents and 15 documents used; monitoring report dated 2025-10-31 is recent and extraction confidence is high.

- Several important fields are not stated in the extracted record (buffer pool %, baseline reassessment date, grid EF, verified ERR), and validation/monitoring contradictions reduce reliability.

Documentation coverage is moderate: 15 documents used, evidence includes PDD, monitoring, validation and issuance, and extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report is recent (2025-10-31). However, several essential items are not present in the extracted facts (buffer pool percentage, baseline reassessment, core MRV figures). Contradictions between monitoring and validation reports about safeguards and leakage reduce the effective quality of the documentation.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed
● <b>Permanence</b>	reversal handling unclear
● <b>Leakage</b>	contradictory / not addressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	project-specific baseline
● <b>Safeguards</b>	contradicted in docs
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or extract missing MRV figures (claimed and verified emission removals, buffer pool percentage) in the monitoring report or registry.

→ Resolve contradictions by publishing a reconciled statement or updated validation/verification that explicitly documents leakage treatment, FPIC, safeguards, grievance mechanism and benefit-sharing.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance-Representation-Single-PP-v4.3-FINAL.pdf
- VCS\_R3\_PRR\_4763\_02Feb 2025.pdf
- CLEAN\_VCS PDMR 4763 01092022-16112023\_V1.4\_.pdf
- [PROJECT ID 4763] puerto\_valle\_garruchos\_delimitation.kml
- VCS\_ProjectArea puerto\_valle\_garruchos20231125.kml
- puerto\_valle\_-\_garruchos\_plots\_stable.kml
- Registration-Representation-Single-PP-v4.4-FINAL.pdf
- MANAGEMENT PLAN PARANA 2 (VCS 4763) V1.0.pdf
- VCS4763 NPR\_REP\_ID4763\_V1.2.pdf
- ID4763 ex-post Forest inventory\_Verification I (V2\_20240705).xlsx
- VCS\_PROJ\_DESC\_PCP\_4763\_10DEC2023.pdf
- [PROJECT ID 4763] Listing-Representation-Single-PP-v4.2\_CAMBIUM.pdf
- Listing-Representation-Single-PP-v4.2.pdf
- VCS\_PROJ\_DESC\_DRAFT\_4763\_10OCT2023.pdf
- Verification-Representation-v4.2.pdf
- VCS-Joint-Validation-and-Verification\_V4\_11112025.pdf
- 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-DCC56F7B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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