QUALITY REPORT

Pina Earth: Forest Adaptation in Germany, Thuringia - Schlegel

CM-bebe8a · ISO 14064-2 · Germany

Report ID: CM-AED9A3B4 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	3.7
	Transparency (25%)	4.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

This ARR project has some core integrity elements in place, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated buffer contribution. However, key risk controls are weakly evidenced in the extracted record, especially around leakage and reversals, and several MRV basics (monitoring period and verified ERs) are not available here.

Project Details

Registry	ISO 14064-2
Registry ID	CM-bebe8a
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

- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (monitoring report says leakage not addressed; validation report deems it negligible).
- ■ Reversal events/risk are not addressed in the extracted record despite a long crediting period (2022–2051).
- ■ Leakage not addressed in project documentation

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.7 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation report).

- Leakage and reversal risk are not credibly evidenced in the extracted record (monitoring report; reversals not addressed).

The validation report indicates additionality was assessed using a performance test and confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality. The baseline is project-specific (PDD), and there is no stated timing for baseline reassessment in the extracted record, which increases baseline uncertainty over a long crediting period (2022–2051). Leakage is not robustly treated: the monitoring report does not address leakage, and reversals are also not addressed in the extracted record, even though an 18.5% buffer contribution is stated.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ Independent VVB is identified (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH).

- Monitoring period and verified emissions reductions/removals are not stated in the extracted record (monitoring report extract).

Transparency is limited by missing MRV essentials in the extracted record: the monitoring period is not stated and neither claimed nor verified total ERs are available. On the positive side, the VVB is clearly identified as TÜV NORD CERT GmbH (validation report), and no material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ Not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (project record).

- Over-crediting risk is harder to rule out because baseline is project-specific and leakage handling is inconsistent (PDD/monitoring vs validation).

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation claims. However, claim safety is weakened by reliance on a project-specific baseline (PDD) and by unclear leakage handling, which can contribute to over-crediting risk. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving some uncertainty about how the credits may be marketed across quality labels.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report).

- Some key items are missing or not extractable here (monitoring period, verified ERs; medium extraction confidence).

Documentation coverage is moderate: three key document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with medium extraction confidence. The extracted record still lacks several quantifications that would normally be expected for strong documentation (monitoring period, claimed and verified ER totals). The absence of recorded corrective actions is positive, but it does not substitute for missing MRV figures.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed performance test
● **Permanence**	Buffer stated, but reversals not addressed
● **Leakage**	Inconsistent/unclear leakage treatment
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards mentioned, but FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish clear leakage assessment and, if applicable, a quantified leakage deduction with justification consistent across validation and monitoring documents.

→ Disclose the monitoring period and the claimed vs verified ER totals (with uncertainty/QA-QC), and explicitly address reversal risk/events and how the 18.5% buffer was determined.

Documents Reviewed

• Monitoring Report
• Project Design Document (PDD)
• Validation / Verification Report

Report ID: CM-AED9A3B4 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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