

QUALITY REPORT

BOSQUE ELÍO

CM-4cbb55 · MITECO · Spain

Report ID: CM-31284A35 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.9

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.2
■ Documentation (15%)	0.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, permanence, and MRV) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high by default.

Project Details

Registry	MITECO
Registry ID	CM-4cbb55
Sector	arr
Country	Spain
Vintage	2024
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability of any missing/partial information.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, buffer/reversal provisions, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record.

~ Ecosystem restoration typically has non-trivial permanence and leakage considerations, but these are not documented here.

No official documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents used), so additionality testing, baseline selection and reassessment, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool or reversal handling) are not stated. Because this is an ecosystem restoration project, permanence and leakage are typically material, but there is no extracted evidence showing how these risks are managed. With no verification/monitoring content available, integrity cannot be substantiated and is scored very low.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB identity, monitoring period, or quantified claimed vs verified removals were found in the extracted record.

- Registry/public disclosure completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and does not provide a VVB name, monitoring period, or any comparison of claimed versus verified removals. Public-data completeness and MRV quality cannot be evaluated from the available extraction. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that missing items are simply absent rather than unreadable.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, reassessment timing, and any leakage/usage assumptions were not found in the extracted record.

~ Eligibility/labeling risk (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) is not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.

Claim safety is weak by default because the extracted record does not state the baseline method, leakage justification/deduction, or any quantified results that would allow an over-crediting screen. The record also does not state any CCP or CORSIA-related status, leaving uncertainty about how credits might be marketed or used. Given the absence of substantiating documentation, conservative scoring is warranted.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- Zero evidence documents were captured (0 documents used), indicating a major evidence gap.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues, reducing auditability.

Documentation is extremely poor: the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source was poorly readable, which further undermines completeness and reliability. Without accessible verification/monitoring reports or a PDD-equivalent, the project is not auditable from the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not documented
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC not documented
● Double-claim	Eligibility/status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and extract the core MITECO project documentation (project design/baseline, monitoring report(s), and any validation/verification report) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and permanence can be evidenced.

→ Disclose quantified MRV outputs (monitoring period, claimed vs verified removals), any findings/corrective actions, and safeguards/grievance documentation to enable an auditable quality assessment.

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-31284A35 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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