

QUALITY REPORT

Cultiva Carbono - Agricola Madroñeros Dos SLU

CM-e57688 · Trinity Natural Capital Markets · Spain

Report ID: CM-E690AB3A · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.0Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.6
■ Transparency (25%)	3.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.8
■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, core carbon-accounting elements (baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, monitoring period, and verified removals) are not stated in the available documents. While a VVB is identified and no material findings or corrective actions are reported, the lack of quantified MRV outputs and key methodological parameters creates a high risk of over-crediting and weak claim defensibility.

Project Details

Registry	Trinity Natural Capital Markets
Registry ID	CM-e57688
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Spain
Vintage	2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023
Project Methodology	Trinity NCM
VVB	European Quality Assurance Spain, S.L. (EQA)
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No baseline method or baseline reassessment timing found in the extracted record.
- No additionality test type or confirmation by the VVB found in the extracted record.
- No leakage deduction or leakage justification found in the extracted record.
- No claimed or verified emission reductions/removals and no monitoring period found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.6 / 10

- Baseline, additionality, leakage, and permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool/reversal handling) are not stated in the extracted record from the validation and monitoring reports.

~ The monitoring report indicates no material findings and no corrective actions, but this does not substitute for missing core accounting parameters.

The extracted record does not state the baseline method or when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens confidence that credited soil carbon outcomes are benchmarked against a defensible counterfactual (validation report; monitoring report). Additionality is also not evidenced in the extracted record: neither the type of additionality test nor confirmation by the VVB is stated (validation report). Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no leakage deduction and no justification stated), and permanence provisions are unclear because buffer pool and reversal-event information are not stated (monitoring report).

Transparency — 3.2 / 10

- The extracted record lacks key MRV transparency items: monitoring period and both claimed and verified removals are not stated.

+ A named VVB (European Quality Assurance Spain, S.L. (EQA)) is identified in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record does not include a monitoring period, nor does it provide claimed or verified emission reductions/removals (monitoring report). While the VVB is named as European Quality Assurance Spain, S.L. (EQA), the absence of quantified MRV outputs prevents cross-checking performance against issuance (validation report; monitoring report). Registry-related completeness is also constrained because key eligibility/status fields are not stated in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 2.8 / 10

- Over-crediting risk is elevated because the extracted record does not state the baseline method, leakage treatment, or any claimed/verified removals.

~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty around downstream claim constraints.

Claim safety is weak because the extracted record lacks the core ingredients needed to judge over-crediting risk: baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any claimed versus verified removals are not stated (validation report; monitoring report). In addition, CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily determine whether additional claim restrictions or reputational risks apply. The absence of usage/monitoring method details in the extracted record further limits confidence in how soil carbon outcomes are tracked over time.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ Two document types are present (validation report and monitoring report) and extraction confidence is medium.

- Document dates and several core fields (crediting period, monitoring period, quantified results) are not stated in the extracted record, limiting auditability.

Documentation is partial: the extracted record includes a validation report and a monitoring report, and extraction confidence is medium. However, document dates are not stated, and many key fields (crediting period, monitoring period, quantified results) are not found in the extracted record, reducing traceability and the ability to independently reproduce calculations. The monitoring report indicates no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is positive but does not resolve the missing core parameters.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found in extracted record
● Permanence	Buffer/reversal provisions not stated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not stated
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistently documented; no FPIC/grievance
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or extract the baseline approach, additionality test (and explicit VVB confirmation), leakage assessment (with any deduction), and permanence provisions (buffer pool and reversal management) from the validation/monitoring documentation.

→ Provide dated monitoring periods and quantified results (claimed and VVB-verified removals), plus a clear MRV/soil sampling and verification protocol summary to enable independent scrutiny.

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-E690AB3A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy