

QUALITY REPORT

Bio-oil produced from biomass

CM-e89032 · Isometric Standard · United States

Report ID: CM-89542310 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.8Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.6
■ Transparency (25%)	2.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.4
■ Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record lacks core quantifications needed to judge credit integrity (baseline approach, additionality test, leakage treatment, monitoring period, and verified removals/avoided emissions). While the documents list no material findings or corrective actions, the absence of key MRV and accounting details creates a high over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Project Details

Registry	Isometric Standard
Registry ID	CM-e89032
Sector	biomass
Country	United States
Vintage	2021, 2023, 2027, 2028
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No baseline method or baseline reassessment timing found in the extracted record
- Additionality approach and whether it was confirmed by an independent VVB are not stated in available documents
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is provided
- No claimed or verified emissions reductions/removals totals found, and the monitoring period is not stated

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.6 / 10

- Baseline, additionality, and leakage treatment are not stated in available documents (PDD/validation/monitoring report referenced but key fields missing in the extracted record).

~ Reversal risk is discussed qualitatively (methodology text notes low reversal risk), but no buffer pool or formal reversal monitoring/response is documented.

The extracted record does not provide a baseline method or when the baseline was last reassessed, which prevents checking whether the counterfactual is conservative (PDD/validation report not evidenced in extracted fields). Additionality is also not evidenced: neither the type of additionality test nor confirmation by a VVB is stated in the extracted record. Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is provided, which is a material integrity gap for biomass-related supply chain risks (monitoring report/PDD fields not evidenced). Reversal is discussed qualitatively in the methodology text as low risk, but reversal events are marked as not addressed and there is no buffer pool percentage stated.

Transparency — 2.8 / 10

- Core MRV items are missing from the extracted record (monitoring period, usage monitoring method, and claimed vs verified totals).

~ Evidence documents are listed (PDD, validation report, monitoring report), but registry/VVB details are not provided.

Although the evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, the extracted record lacks basic MRV transparency items such as the monitoring period and the usage monitoring method. There are no extracted totals for claimed or verified emissions reductions/removals, so readers cannot reconcile issuance quantities to monitoring outcomes. The VVB name and registry details are also not found in the extracted record, reducing traceability.

Claim Safety — 2.4 / 10

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.

- High over-crediting risk because baseline and leakage accounting are not evidenced in the extracted record.

Because the baseline approach and leakage treatment are not evidenced in the extracted record, there is a heightened risk that credited quantities could be overstated, making public climate claims less safe. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily determine whether the unit is being positioned for multiple claim channels. The lack of extracted claimed-versus-verified totals further increases greenwashing risk because third parties cannot validate what was actually verified.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ Three document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and no material findings/corrective actions are reported.

- Key metadata is missing (document dates, VVB name, methodology/version), limiting auditability.

Documentation coverage is partial: three document types are listed (PDD, validation report, monitoring report), and the extraction confidence is medium, suggesting the documents were at least moderately readable. However, key identifiers and metadata are missing from the extracted record (VVB name, document dates, methodology and version, registry), which limits independent verification. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, but the absence of core quantified fields suggests incompleteness rather than clean performance.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced
● Permanence	Low-risk narrative but no buffer/plan
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistent/absent in monitoring
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and document the baseline approach (including reassessment timing) and provide the full quantified calculation that links activity data to credited outcomes.

→ Provide a complete monitoring/verification package: monitoring period, usage monitoring method, claimed vs verified totals, VVB identity, and an explicit leakage assessment with any deductions.

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-89542310 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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