

## QUALITY REPORT

# Cultiva Carbono - El Mesto

CM-8d82da · Trinity Natural Capital Markets · Spain

Report ID: CM-6B3CA814 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 4.2

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.8
■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some credibility signals (third-party validation/verification by EQA and no reported material findings), but key quantification details needed to judge soil-carbon credit integrity are missing from the extracted record. In particular, the baseline approach, leakage treatment, monitoring period, and verified removals are not stated in the available documents, increasing over-crediting and claims risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Trinity Natural Capital Markets
Registry ID	CM-8d82da
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Spain
Vintage	2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022
Project Methodology	Trinity NCM 1.1
Crediting Period	2023 — 2033
VVB	European Quality Assurance Spain, S.L. (EQA)
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Verified removals are not stated in the extracted record, and there is no claimed-versus-verified comparison available.
- Baseline method is not stated in the available documents, despite a baseline reassessment year being cited (2019).
- Leakage deduction and justification are not stated in the available documents for a soil carbon project where leakage can be relevant.
- Safeguards are mentioned but FPIC and a grievance mechanism are not stated in the available documents.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification body (EQA) is identified and the documents indicate additionality was confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation in the extracted record).

- Core integrity parameters (baseline method, leakage treatment, buffer/reversal provisions, and verified removals) are not stated in the available documents.

The extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (EQA) in the validation/verification documentation, which is a positive integrity signal. However, the baseline method is not stated in the available documents, even though a baseline reassessment year of 2019 is cited, making it hard to judge baseline validity. Leakage deduction and justification are not stated in the available documents, and buffer pool percentage and any reversal provisions/events are also not stated, which is material for soil carbon permanence risk.

### Transparency — 4.0 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report), and no material findings or corrective actions are reported (monitoring/verification documentation in the extracted record).

- Monitoring period and verified ER/ERR totals are not stated in the available documents, limiting MRV transparency.

Transparency is constrained because the monitoring period is not stated in the available documents, and neither claimed nor verified total removals are provided in the extracted record (monitoring report). While the presence of a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report supports basic traceability, the absence of quantified MRV outputs prevents an independent reader from checking performance. The extracted record reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which helps, but does not substitute for missing quantitative disclosures.

### Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

+ No material findings or corrective actions are reported, which reduces the likelihood of known non-conformities (monitoring/verification documentation in the extracted record).

- CORSIA/CCP status is not stated and key quantification inputs (baseline and leakage) are missing, elevating over-crediting and marketing-claim risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the lack of stated verified removals and missing baseline and leakage details, which increases the risk of over-crediting in public claims. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess alignment with higher-integrity eligibility screens. Safeguards are mentioned, but FPIC and a grievance mechanism are not stated, which can create reputational risk for downstream claims.

### Documentation — 5.2 / 10

+ Three document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is medium.

- Document date and several critical fields (monitoring period, quantified results, safeguards specifics) are not stated in the available documents.

Documentation coverage is moderate: the extracted record includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, and identifies the VVB as EQA. Extraction confidence is medium, but the document date is not stated, and several critical fields (monitoring period, quantified results, leakage treatment, safeguards specifics) are not stated in the available documents. The absence of corrective actions and material findings is positive, but the missing core parameters reduce documentary completeness.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline approach not evidenced
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards partial (FPIC/grievance not evidenced)
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the monitoring period and publish claimed and verified total removals for the period, including uncertainty and any adjustments, in the monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Provide explicit baseline method details and leakage assessment (deduction percentage and justification), and document permanence risk management (e.g., buffer contribution and reversal procedures) for soil carbon.

## 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-6B3CA814 · 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)