

QUALITY REPORT

Pina Earth: Turning a monoculture into a biodiverse forest in Germany, Brandenburg - Luckaitz Valley

CM-27cc50 · ISO 14064-2 · Germany

Report ID: CM-286DAFB1 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

The project has some credibility signals (third-party validation/verification by TÜV NORD and an 18.5% buffer), but key integrity elements are missing or inconsistently documented, especially baseline and leakage treatment. Public-facing MRV completeness appears limited in the extracted record (no monitoring period and no verified/claimed ERR figures captured), increasing uncertainty and over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	ISO 14064-2
Registry ID	CM-27cc50
Sector	arr
Country	Germany
Vintage	2022
Project Methodology	VM0012 1.2
Crediting Period	2022 — 2051
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, making it hard to judge additionality and over-crediting risk.
- Leakage is inconsistently treated across documents (negligible vs not addressed), with no quantified leakage deduction reported.
- Reversal events/risk treatment is not addressed in the extracted record despite a long crediting period (2022–2051).
- No FPIC and no grievance mechanism are reported, weakening safeguards credibility.
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.7 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification by TÜV NORD CERT GmbH).

- Baseline and leakage treatment are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and reversal risk is not addressed.

The validation/verification documentation indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH), which supports integrity. However, the baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record (PDD/monitoring/validation), limiting confidence that credited removals are conservative. Leakage is not consistently addressed and no leakage deduction is reported, and reversal events/risk treatment is not addressed despite an 18.5% buffer pool stated in the monitoring report (2023-02-16).

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ Independent VVB is identified (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH) and no material findings/corrective actions are reported.

- Monitoring period and claimed/verified ERR totals were not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

The extracted record identifies the VVB (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH) and shows no material findings or corrective actions in the monitoring report (2023-02-16). At the same time, the monitoring period and both claimed and verified ERR totals were not found in the extracted record, which prevents an external reader from reconciling issuance quantities to measured outcomes. The presence of contradictions across documents further reduces transparency because it is unclear which narrative governs implementation.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Missing baseline and inconsistent leakage narrative increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-stakes aviation claims. However, over-crediting risk remains elevated because the baseline method is not stated in the extracted record and leakage is inconsistently described between documents, with no quantified deduction. CCP status was not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily map the project to higher-integrity claim frameworks.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ Three core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with medium extraction confidence.

- Contradictions between monitoring and validation reports on leakage and safeguards reduce reliability.

Documentation coverage is moderate: the extracted record includes a PDD, a validation report, and a monitoring report (three documents) with medium extraction confidence. The monitoring report is dated 2023-02-16 and the validation report 2023-02-22, suggesting recency, but key quantitative MRV fields (monitoring period, ERR claimed/verified) were not captured in the extracted record. Contradictions on leakage and safeguards between the monitoring and validation reports reduce confidence in document consistency.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Buffer stated, reversal treatment unclear
● Leakage	Inconsistent and unquantified leakage
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and clearly justify the baseline approach (including reassessment schedule) and provide a transparent ERR calculation summary that reconciles monitoring data to credits issued.

→ Provide a consistent leakage assessment across documents (quantify leakage or justify negligible with evidence) and explicitly document reversal risk management (monitoring, triggers, and buffer drawdown rules).

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-286DAFB1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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