

## QUALITY REPORT

# ACTUACIÓN PARA LA RECUPERACIÓN EN SOTO DE BAYONA

CT-717 · Spain

Report ID: CM-75793526 · Generated: 2026-04-24 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**1.8**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>0.5</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>2.5</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>2.0</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>3.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

Documentation is minimal (single monitoring report) and key quality elements are not reported. There is no evidence available on additionality, baseline method, leakage treatment or permanence safeguards, creating high uncertainty and low confidence in environmental integrity.

## Project Details

Registry ID	CT-717
Sector	arr
Country	Spain
Vintage	2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-24

## Red Flags

- No additionality assessment or VVB confirmation found in available documents
- Baseline method, leakage deduction and buffer treatment are not stated in the extracted record
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 0.5 / 10

- No additionality test or VVB confirmation found in the monitoring report (not stated in available documents).
- ~ No baseline method, leakage deduction, or buffer percentage documented; reversal events not reported (monitoring report).

The available monitoring report (dated 2025-03-03) contains no documented additionality test or VVB confirmation, and the record does not state a baseline method, leakage deduction, or buffer pool percentage. No reversal events are reported in the extracted record, but that absence appears to be a documentation gap rather than clear evidence of permanence protections. Given these missing core facts, integrity is low.

### Transparency — 2.5 / 10

- Only one evidence document used (a monitoring report dated 2025-03-03); registry listed as 'other'.
- ~ No material findings or corrective actions reported in the verification record, but those fields may reflect limited extraction rather than full transparency.

Transparency is weak: only one evidence document was used (a monitoring report) and the registry is listed as 'other'. Key MRV figures (claimed vs verified reductions, monitoring period, VVB name) are not present in the extracted record. While no material findings were recorded in the extracted fields, the many nulls indicate insufficient public or extracted disclosure.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Baseline approach and leakage justification not stated, so over-crediting risk cannot be ruled out (not found in extracted record).
- ~ Yellow risk on double-claim because CORSIA/CCP eligibility is not stated; dual-channel risk unresolved.

There is a high risk of over-claiming because baseline methodology, leakage treatment and any non-forest reference levels are not documented in the available file. CORSIA/CCP status is also not stated, leaving unresolved the possibility of double claims. The lack of quantified ERR or usage monitoring increases claim uncertainty.

### Documentation — 3.0 / 10

- Only a single monitoring report was extracted (n\_docs\_used=1) and many key fields are not stated.
- ~ Medium extraction confidence reduces certainty but is not as damaging as low confidence.

Documentation score reflects that a single monitoring report (project name shown as BOSQUE LA TORRECILLA) was available with medium extraction confidence and no supplementary documents listed. The document date is recent (2025-03-03), which is positive, but the narrow evidence base and many missing fields lower confidence.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	no test documented
● <b>Permanence</b>	permanence unaddressed
● <b>Leakage</b>	no leakage treatment
● <b>Baseline</b>	baseline not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	safeguards not documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status unknown

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the project baseline methodology and the most recent baseline reassessment report (including quantified ERR figures).

→ Publish VVB verification statements that confirm additionality, leakage deduction, buffer treatment and any reversal history, and disclose registry and CCP/CORSIA eligibility status.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring 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-75793526 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-24 · Generated: 2026-04-24

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)