

QUALITY REPORT

Bosque CO2 GESTIÓN “La Carballeda”

CM-ae6216 · MITECO · Spain

Report ID: CM-2BF258AC · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	3.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.4
	■ 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 significant evidence gaps on core carbon-accounting elements (baseline approach, additionality test, leakage treatment, and quantified results). While the document set includes a PDD, validation report, and a 2022 monitoring report with no material findings or corrective actions noted, the lack of key quantified parameters materially weakens confidence in credit integrity and safe claims.

Project Details

Registry	MITECO
Registry ID	CM-ae6216
Sector	other
Country	Spain
Vintage	2016
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, limiting the ability to assess over-crediting risk.
- Baseline approach and additionality test are not stated in the extracted record, undermining confidence that removals are additional and correctly quantified.
- Leakage deduction and justification are not stated in the extracted record for a land-based removal project where leakage assessment is typically expected.
- No information found on permanence risk management (e.g., buffer pool) or any reversal monitoring/results.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

- + The monitoring report (2022) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.
- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence risk controls were not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2022) indicates no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is a positive signal for process compliance. However, the extracted record does not provide the baseline approach, any additionality test, leakage deduction/justification, or permanence risk management (such as a buffer pool), which are central to removal integrity. Reversal events and reversal monitoring outcomes were also not found in the extracted record, leaving permanence performance unassessable.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are evidenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report).
- Key MRV fields (monitoring period and verified removals) were not found in the extracted record.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, and a monitoring report dated 2022-02-22, suggesting some level of public documentation. Still, the extracted record lacks the monitoring period and any quantified claimed or verified removals, preventing an external reader from reproducing or even sanity-checking the reported climate benefit. The VVB name is also not found in the extracted record, reducing traceability of independent assurance.

Claim Safety — 3.4 / 10

- No claimed vs verified removal totals were found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting/greenwashing risk.
- ~ CORSIA and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so eligibility-related claim constraints cannot be assessed.

Because neither claimed nor verified removal totals are found in the extracted record, it is not possible to check whether issuance aligns with monitored performance, elevating over-crediting and greenwashing risk. Baseline and leakage approaches are also not found in the extracted record, which are common drivers of over-crediting in land-based removals. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, so the risk of inappropriate eligibility-related claims cannot be screened.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

- + Three document types are referenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is medium.
- The VVB name and confirmation of additionality by the VVB were not found in the extracted record.

Documentation coverage is moderate: the extracted record references three key document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is medium rather than low. However, many critical fields that should be present in these documents (baseline method, additionality test, monitoring period, quantified results, leakage treatment, permanence provisions, and VVB identity) were not found in the extracted record. The absence of these core data points materially limits auditability from the extracted dataset.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence controls not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline approach not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned, details unclear
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or extract the quantified monitoring results (claimed and verified removals), the monitoring period, and the calculation workbook so third parties can reproduce totals.

→ Disclose the baseline approach and additionality demonstration used in the PDD/validation report, including how baseline was set and whether it is periodically reassessed.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment (deduction percentage and justification) and permanence risk management (e.g., buffer/bonding, reversal monitoring and response procedures).

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-2BF258AC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy