

QUALITY REPORT

Pina Earth: Creating a climate-resilient forest in Germany, Bavaria & Baden-Wurttemberg - Lindorf

CM-d4a90a · ISO 14064-2 · Germany

Report ID: CM-ED5FA02D · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
■ Documentation (15%)	6.7

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some integrity strengths, notably VVB-confirmed additionality and an explicit buffer contribution of 18.5%, with no material findings or corrective actions reported in the validation report (2023). However, key quantification elements (baseline approach, monitoring period, and verified removals) were not found in the extracted record, and leakage is only described as “deemed negligible” without a stated deduction. These gaps and an internal safeguards inconsistency reduce confidence in crediting precision and public claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	ISO 14064-2
Registry ID	CM-d4a90a
Sector	arr
Country	Germany
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	VM0012 v1.2
Crediting Period	2021 — 2051
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and timing of baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in over-crediting risk controls.
- Leakage is only described as “deemed negligible” with no stated leakage deduction percentage in the extracted record.
- No claimed or verified net removals (ERR) totals were found in the extracted record, and the monitoring period is not stated.
- Safeguards disclosure is contradictory between documents dated the same day, indicating data reliability issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the validation report (2023).

- Baseline method and baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, and leakage is not quantified beyond “deemed negligible”.

The validation report (2023-11-08) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports integrity. A buffer contribution of 18.5% is stated, which is relevant for permanence risk management in forest restoration. However, the baseline method and the date of any baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record, making it difficult to judge baseline robustness. Leakage is only described as “deemed negligible” and no leakage deduction percentage is stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence that leakage is conservatively handled.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ An independent VVB is identified (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH) and the evidence set includes a PDD plus validation and monitoring documents.

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

The extracted record identifies the VVB as TÜV NORD CERT GmbH and includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, which is a reasonable documentation set. However, the monitoring period is not stated in available documents, and neither claimed nor verified ERR totals were found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to independently understand what was measured and credited. The absence of quantified MRV outputs in the extracted record reduces transparency even if underlying calculations may exist in the source documents.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

+ A buffer contribution of 18.5% is stated, which can reduce non-permanence risk for restoration activities.

- CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in available documents, and baseline/leakage quantification gaps increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Because the baseline method is not found in the extracted record and leakage is not quantified beyond “deemed negligible,” there is elevated risk that credited removals could be overstated relative to a conservative counterfactual. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess alignment with higher-integrity eligibility screens. The stated 18.5% buffer contribution helps mitigate non-permanence risk, but it does not substitute for clear baseline and leakage quantification when making public claims.

Documentation — 6.7 / 10

+ Three core document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- A direct contradiction on safeguards presence between documents dated 2023-11-08 undermines documentation reliability.

The evidence set includes three key document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting a moderate-to-good documentation score. The validation report (2023-11-08) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which suggests a clean assurance outcome. However, there is a direct inconsistency on whether safeguards are mentioned, which reduces confidence in the completeness and consistency of disclosures.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Buffer stated (18.5%), reversals not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage deemed negligible, not quantified
● Baseline	Baseline approach not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Disclose the baseline approach used (including key parameters and any reassessment schedule) and summarize why it is conservative for this ARR/restoration context.
- Publish monitoring-period details and headline MRV outputs (claimed and verified net removals) with uncertainty/QA-QC notes, and state an explicit leakage deduction (even if 0%) with a clear justification.
- Resolve the safeguards inconsistency by aligning validation/monitoring disclosures and adding evidence of FPIC (where applicable), benefit-sharing arrangements, and a functioning grievance mechanism.

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-ED5FA02D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy