

QUALITY REPORT

LIENZO EN NEGRO

CT-864 · Gold Standard · Spain

Report ID: CM-A69B6A31 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.6

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.5
■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

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, permanence, and MRV results) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting or unsupported claims is high based on the available evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CT-864
Sector	arr
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 additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring results
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record due to missing documents

~ Gold Standard is stated as the program, but no supporting verification/monitoring evidence is available here to confirm quality

No verification report, monitoring report, or PDD was included in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and permanence measures (e.g., buffer or reversal procedures) are not stated in available documents. With no extracted evidence, integrity cannot be demonstrated and must be scored conservatively.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified ER figures were found in the extracted record

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured

The extracted record contains no evidence documents and no fields for VVB identity, monitoring period, or claimed versus verified emission reductions. As a result, MRV transparency and registry completeness cannot be evaluated from the available materials.

Claim Safety — 2.5 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, leakage justification, and verified outcomes were not found in the extracted record

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unresolved

Because baseline method, leakage justification/deductions, and any verified results are not found in the extracted record, the risk of unsupported or overstated climate claims cannot be ruled out. CORSIA and CCP status are also not stated in available documents, leaving eligibility and double-claim risk unclear.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, leaving the assessment unsupported by primary sources

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues

The extracted record shows 0 documents used and low extraction confidence, indicating that either documents were unavailable or not readable enough for reliable extraction. This is a major evidence gap and materially limits confidence in any quality assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, latest monitoring report, and latest verification report (including VVB name, monitoring period, and verified ERs) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be assessed

→ Publish or extract registry details (issuance/retirement records, methodology, and any eligibility statements such as CCP/CORSIA) to reduce double-claim and greenwashing 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-A69B6A31 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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