

QUALITY REPORT

BOSQUE ETXARRI

CM-4042d1 · MITECO · Spain

Report ID: CM-0D7C80B1 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.3
	■ Transparency (25%)	3.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, this MITECO removal project has major evidence gaps on core quality determinants (additionality, baseline approach, leakage, permanence and reversals). While three key document types are present and no material findings or corrective actions are reported, the absence of quantified MRV outputs and methodological details materially limits confidence in credit quality and claims.

Project Details

Registry	MITECO
Registry ID	CM-4042d1
Sector	arr
Country	Spain
Vintage	2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Additionality approach and whether it was confirmed by an independent verifier are not stated in the extracted record.
- Baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record.
- Permanence risk management (buffer contribution) and any reversal events are not stated in the extracted record.
- Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) is not stated in the extracted record.
- No verified vs claimed removal totals or monitoring period details are available in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.3 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2024-05-21) shows no material findings and no corrective actions required.

- Key integrity elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence/buffer, reversals) are not stated in the extracted record across the available documents.

The monitoring report (2024-05-21) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is a positive signal on process compliance. However, the extracted record does not state the additionality test used or whether additionality was confirmed by an independent verifier (validation report). The baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record (PDD/monitoring), and neither leakage deductions nor leakage justification are captured. For a removal project, permanence provisions (buffer contribution) and any reversal events are also not stated in the extracted record, materially weakening integrity confidence.

Transparency — 3.2 / 10

+ A monitoring report, validation report, and PDD are listed as available evidence documents.

- The extracted record does not include monitoring period dates or any claimed/verified removal totals, limiting traceability of results.

The evidence set includes a monitoring report, validation report, and PDD, which suggests the project has the standard documentation types available. Despite that, the extracted record lacks basic MRV transparency items such as the monitoring period and the claimed versus verified total removals. The absence of these quantitative outputs prevents an external reader from reconciling issuance with monitored performance. The verifier identity is also not stated in the extracted record, reducing transparency around independent assurance.

Claim Safety — 3.0 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so downstream claim constraints cannot be assessed.

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and leakage approaches are not stated in the extracted record.

Claim safety is constrained by missing eligibility and quality labels: CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record. More importantly, the baseline approach and leakage treatment are not stated in the extracted record, so over-crediting risk cannot be screened. With no claimed and verified totals captured, it is also not possible to check for discrepancies between what was claimed and what was verified for the monitoring period.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

+ Three core document types are present (monitoring report, validation report, PDD) and the monitoring report is recent (2024-05-21).

- Extraction confidence is only medium and many key fields were not captured from the documents, indicating incomplete/uncertain documentation in the extracted record.

Documentation coverage is moderate because three key document types are listed (monitoring report, validation report, PDD) and the monitoring report is recent (2024-05-21). However, many critical fields were not extracted (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence/buffer, reversals, monitoring period, totals), indicating that the available extracted record is incomplete for quality assessment. The minimum extraction confidence is medium, which supports a mid-range documentation score but not a high one. No corrective actions are reported in the monitoring report, which slightly supports documentation adequacy.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced in extracted record
● Permanence	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose (or extract) the baseline methodology, baseline reassessment timing, and the additionality test used, with explicit confirmation in the validation/verification documentation.

→ Provide (or extract) the monitoring period dates and the claimed vs verified total removals for the period, including leakage treatment and permanence risk management (buffer contribution and any reversal reporting).

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / 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-0D7C80B1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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