

QUALITY REPORT

BOSQUE ALALPARDO

CM-962a63 · MITECO · Spain

Report ID: CM-E684E2BD · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.3
	■ Transparency (25%)	3.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, key integrity elements for a forest removal project (additionality approach, baseline method, leakage treatment, permanence/buffer provisions, and quantified results) are not stated in the available documents. While three core documents are present and no material findings or corrective actions are reported, the lack of quantified monitoring outcomes and core methodological details materially increases over-crediting and claim-risk.

Project Details

Registry	MITECO
Registry ID	CM-962a63
Sector	arr
Country	Spain
Vintage	2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No quantified claimed or verified removals were found in the extracted record (no stated ERR figures).
- Baseline approach and reassessment timing are not stated in the available documents.
- No leakage deduction or leakage justification is stated, despite ARR projects commonly having leakage considerations.
- No permanence risk management information was found (no buffer pool percentage and no reversal reporting).
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.3 / 10

- Additionality, baseline method, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record (PDD/validation/monitoring report).

~ The monitoring report (2022) indicates no material findings and no corrective actions, but this does not substitute for missing core quantifications.

For an ARR removal project, the extracted record does not state the additionality test used or whether additionality was confirmed by an independent verifier (PDD and validation report). The baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are also not stated in the available documents (PDD). Leakage is not quantified and no justification is provided (monitoring report), and permanence provisions are unclear because no buffer pool percentage or reversal reporting was found (monitoring report).

Transparency — 3.4 / 10

+ A monitoring report (2022), validation report, and PDD are listed as evidence documents, suggesting some public documentation exists.

- Core MRV outputs and parameters (monitoring period, claimed/verified removals, and monitoring methods) were not stated in the available documents.

The evidence set includes a PDD, a validation report, and a monitoring report dated 2022-08-25, which supports basic traceability. However, the monitoring period, the monitoring/usage methods, and the total claimed versus verified removals are not stated in the extracted record (monitoring report). The absence of these core MRV details limits third-party ability to reproduce or sanity-check results.

Claim Safety — 3.0 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the available documents, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline and leakage approaches and verified totals were not found in the extracted record.

Claim risk is elevated because neither total claimed removals nor total verified removals are stated in the extracted record (monitoring report), making it impossible to assess the magnitude and conservativeness of credited outcomes. Baseline and leakage approaches are not stated (PDD/monitoring report), which increases over-crediting uncertainty for ARR. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not stated in the available documents, leaving downstream eligibility/labeling claims uncertain.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ Three key document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report dated 2022-08-25).

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

Three core document types are listed (PDD, validation report, monitoring report), and the monitoring report is relatively recent (2022-08-25). No material findings and no corrective actions are reported in the extracted record (monitoring report), which is a positive signal. Still, many critical fields are missing and the minimum extraction confidence is only medium, so documentation quality and extractability appear limited.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not quantified or justified
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or extract the quantified monitoring results for the stated monitoring period, including total claimed and independently verified removals and any uncertainty/adjustments (monitoring report and verification/validation documentation).

→ Disclose the baseline approach (including reassessment schedule), leakage assessment with justification and any deduction, and permanence risk management (buffer contribution and reversal monitoring/response) in the PDD and monitoring documentation.

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-E684E2BD · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy