

QUALITY REPORT

RESTAURACIÓN AMBIENTAL EN UNA EXPLOTACIÓN MINERA EN BEMBIBRE

CM-e3828a · MITECO · Spain

Report ID: CM-02A2931C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.1
	■ Transparency (25%)	2.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	3.4

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the single available project design document (2022), key integrity elements for a removal project—baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, and permanence/reversal management—are not evidenced in the extracted record. Safeguards and grievance provisions are also not documented, increasing reputational and over-crediting risk. Overall confidence is limited by the absence of monitoring/verification information and quantified results.

Project Details

Registry	MITECO
Registry ID	CM-e3828a
Sector	arr
Country	Spain
Vintage	2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No additionality test or third-party validation/verification evidence found in the extracted record (only a PDD is available).
- No baseline method or reassessment information found, which is central to quantifying removals and avoiding over-crediting.
- No permanence provisions (buffer pool or reversal monitoring/response) found for a removal project.
- Safeguards, FPIC, and grievance mechanism are not documented in the extracted record.
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.1 / 10

- Baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, and reversal/buffer provisions are not found in the extracted record (PDD, 2022).

~ No material findings or corrective actions are listed, but this appears to reflect missing verification documentation rather than confirmed audit outcomes (PDD, 2022).

The extracted record contains only a project design document (2022) and does not provide an additionality test type or confirmation by an independent verifier. For a removal project, the baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not found, making it difficult to judge whether credited removals are conservative. Leakage treatment (deduction or justification) and permanence management (buffer pool or reversal procedures/events) are also not found in the extracted record (PDD, 2022).

Transparency — 2.4 / 10

- No monitoring period, monitoring approach, or verified vs claimed removals are provided in the extracted record (PDD, 2022).

- No verifier/VVB name is provided, limiting traceability of any independent assurance (PDD, 2022).

Transparency is limited because the monitoring period, monitoring approach, and any usage/field monitoring method are not found in the extracted record (PDD, 2022). Claimed and verified emission reduction/removal totals are also not provided, preventing a basic reconciliation of what was issued versus what was measured. No verifier/VVB name is listed, reducing audit traceability (PDD, 2022).

Claim Safety — 2.8 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be assessed because baseline method, leakage justification, and quantified results are not found in the extracted record (PDD, 2022).

~ CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, leaving eligibility/claims risk unclear (PDD, 2022).

Claim safety is constrained by missing quantification fundamentals: baseline method, leakage justification, and verified results are not found in the extracted record (PDD, 2022). CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot rely on those labels to reduce greenwashing risk. With safeguards and grievance provisions not documented, reputational risk for public claims is elevated (PDD, 2022).

Documentation — 3.4 / 10

- Only one document (a PDD dated 2022-10-05) is available; no monitoring or verification reports are included (extracted record).

~ Extraction confidence is medium, but the lack of supporting documents limits completeness (extracted record).

Documentation is incomplete: only one evidence document (a PDD dated 2022-10-05) is included, with no monitoring report, verification report, or registry-facing issuance/retirement evidence in the extracted record. The extraction confidence is medium, but the main limitation is the absence of supporting documents rather than readability issues. No corrective actions are listed, but without verification documentation this does not provide assurance (extracted record).

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	No safeguards/FPIC/grievance documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide monitoring and verification reports showing the monitoring period, quantified removals, uncertainty/QA-QC, and the verifier's opinion (including any findings and corrective actions).
- Disclose the baseline and leakage approach (including reassessment schedule and any deductions) and document permanence management (reversal monitoring, response plan, and any buffer/insurance mechanism).

Documents Reviewed

- Project Design Document (PDD)

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-02A2931C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy