QUALITY REPORT

Edaphos Engineering

CM-00b965 · ISO 14064-2 · Switzerland

Report ID: CM-0C029735 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.8

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	3.2
Transparency (25%)	4.1
Claim Safety (25%)	3.6
Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains major evidence gaps for core ISO 14064-2 quality determinants (additionality approach, baseline definition, leakage treatment, and quantified verified removals). While the monitoring period and a set of key documents are present, the lack of quantified results and methodological specifics materially increases over-crediting and greenwashing risk for a DAC/CCS claim.

Project Details

Registry	ISO 14064-2
Registry ID	CM-00b965
Sector	dac
Country	Switzerland
Vintage	2023
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ No quantified verified removals were found in the extracted record (no verified total emissions reductions/removals figure).

■ Additionality approach and whether it was confirmed by the VVB were not found in the extracted record.

■ Baseline method and any reassessment timing were not stated in available documents.

■ Leakage deduction and justification were not stated in available documents for a project type where upstream energy and supply-chain leakage can be material.

■ Safeguards elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are explicitly not documented in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

- The PDD/validation/monitoring set (as listed) does not yield an identifiable additionality test, baseline method, leakage treatment, or permanence provisions in the extracted record.

~ The monitoring report (dated 2024-12) reports no material findings or corrective actions, but this does not substitute for missing core quantification and methodological details.

For a DAC/CCS project, integrity depends heavily on a clearly defined baseline, robust additionality demonstration, quantified leakage, and permanence/reversal management. In the extracted record, the additionality test type and whether additionality was confirmed by the VVB are not stated in available documents (PDD/validation report not yielding these fields). Leakage deduction and justification are also not stated in available documents, and permanence provisions such as a buffer contribution or any reversal reporting are not found in the extracted record. The monitoring report (2024-12) shows no material findings or corrective actions, but the absence of core methodological and quantified elements keeps integrity low.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

+ A monitoring period is clearly stated (2021-01-01 to 2024-12-31) and multiple document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report).

- Key MRV outputs and inputs (verified removals, methodology, VVB name, grid factor, monitoring methods) were not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is mixed: the monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period (2021-01-01—2024-12-31) and the evidence set includes a PDD and validation report. However, the extracted record does not include the VVB name, the applied methodology and version, the monitoring/usage monitoring method, or any verified total removals figure. The lack of both claimed and verified totals in the extracted record prevents an independent reader from checking whether reported outcomes align with monitoring evidence.

Claim Safety — 3.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing one channel of double-claiming risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated because verified removal totals, baseline approach, and leakage treatment are not stated in available documents.

Claim safety is constrained by missing quantification and missing methodological parameters that would allow assessment of over-crediting risk. Neither claimed nor verified total removals are found in the extracted record, and baseline and leakage approaches are not stated in available documents, which is particularly important for DAC where energy sourcing and upstream emissions can dominate net removals. On the positive side, the project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, lowering the risk of CORSIA-related double-claiming, but CCP status is not stated in available documents.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ Three core document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with a recent monitoring report date (2024-12).

- Extraction confidence is only medium and many critical fields (VVB identity, methodology/version, quantified results) were not found in the extracted record.

Documentation coverage is moderate because the extracted record indicates three key document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and a recent monitoring report date (2024-12). Still, many critical items that should be readily extractable from these documents—such as the VVB identity, methodology/version, baseline definition, leakage treatment, and verified totals—were not found in the extracted record. The minimum extraction confidence is medium, suggesting some readability/structure limitations that may have contributed to missing fields.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Additionality test not found
Permanence	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
Safeguards	Safeguards not documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish (or extract clearly) the quantified claimed and verified net removals for 2021–2024, including uncertainty, data sources, and any VVB adjustments from the verification/validation documentation.

→ Disclose the baseline definition and additionality demonstration used under ISO 14064-2, and document leakage accounting (energy sourcing, upstream emissions) plus permanence/reversal management (storage monitoring, liability, and any buffer/insurance approach).

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-0C029735 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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