

QUALITY REPORT

SALVARIOS SALVAMARES

CT-781 · Gold Standard · Spain

Report ID: CM-FF0BCDDB · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.9

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	1.2
■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.5
■ Documentation (15%)	0.6

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high based on evidence gaps alone.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CT-781
Sector	other
Country	Spain
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, or monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.2 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record due to missing documents.

~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of source material.

No project design, monitoring, or verification documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality, baseline validity, leakage treatment, permanence/reversal provisions, and any material findings cannot be assessed. With these core integrity elements not stated in available documents, the score is heavily penalized for evidence gaps.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (VVB, monitoring period, ERR claimed vs verified) were found in the extracted record.

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

The extracted record does not include a verification body name, monitoring period, or any comparison of emission reductions claimed versus verified, because no documents were available. As a result, MRV transparency and registry completeness cannot be substantiated from the provided evidence set.

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and leakage assumptions are not available in the extracted record.

~ CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, so double-claim/eligibility risk cannot be screened.

Because baseline method, leakage justification/deductions, and any usage or default factors are not available in the extracted record, the risk of overstated climate impact cannot be screened. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not stated in available documents, leaving double-claim/market-eligibility risk unresolved.

Documentation — 0.6 / 10

- No evidence documents were captured (0 documents used), indicating severe documentation incompleteness.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues, reducing confidence in any missing/absent fields.

The evidence list is empty and the number of documents used is zero, indicating that the documentation set is missing entirely. The minimum extraction confidence is low, which further reduces confidence that the absence of information reflects true absence rather than unreadable or unprocessed sources.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports (including VVB opinion) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and verified ERs can be assessed.

→ Provide registry extracts and eligibility statements (CORSIA/CCP), plus safeguards documentation (stakeholder consultation/FPIC and grievance mechanism) to reduce claim and double-claim risk.

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-FF0BCDDB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy