

QUALITY REPORT

CO2 storage following the application of Limenet technology in Augusta site

CMARK-2 · CMARK · Italy

Report ID: CM-253C54C9 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	2.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	2.4

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

Assessment Summary

This removal project has major evidence gaps on core carbon-accounting elements (baseline approach, additionality, leakage, and reversal management) in the extracted record. While a VVB (RINA Services S.p.A.) and a recent verification report are present, low document readability and missing quantified MRV outputs materially limit confidence in credit integrity and safe claims.

Project Details

Registry	CMARK
Registry ID	CMARK-2
Sector	other
Country	Italy
Vintage	2024
Project Methodology	CO2 storage following the application of Limenet technology 001 – A
VVB	RINA SERVICES S.p.A.
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Additionality approach and whether it was confirmed by the VVB are not found in the extracted record.
- Baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents.
- Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) is not stated in available documents.
- Reversal risk management (buffer pool or other provisions) and any reversal events are not stated in available documents.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or misread critical details.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.6 / 10

- Additionality, baseline, leakage, and reversal provisions are not found in the extracted record (verification report dated 2025-04-17 referenced, but key fields not captured).

~ No material findings or corrective actions were reported in the verification report (2025-04-17), but this is hard to rely on given low extraction confidence.

The extracted record does not provide an additionality test type or confirmation by the VVB, so additionality robustness cannot be assessed (verification report dated 2025-04-17 referenced). The baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents, which prevents checking whether removals are credited against a defensible counterfactual. Leakage deduction and justification are also not found in the extracted record, and reversal risk management (e.g., buffer pool) is not stated, which is a major gap for a CO2 storage/removal claim. Although the verification report (2025-04-17) shows no material findings and no corrective actions, low extraction confidence reduces how much weight this can carry.

Transparency — 2.4 / 10

+ A named VVB (RINA Services S.p.A.) and a defined monitoring period (2024-09-07 to 2024-10-18) are provided (verification report, 2025-04-17).

- Quantified results (claimed vs verified removals) and key MRV parameters are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record lacks the total removals claimed and verified, so users cannot reconcile issuance with measured outcomes. Positively, the verification report (2025-04-17) identifies the VVB as RINA Services S.p.A. and specifies a monitoring period from 2024-09-07 to 2024-10-18. However, key MRV descriptors (such as the monitoring approach for usage/process data and any fossil/natural boundary method) are not found in the extracted record. The registry is listed only as "other" with no further completeness indicators captured here.

Claim Safety — 2.8 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, leakage treatment, and verified removal totals are not found in the extracted record.

~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unclear.

Safe public claims are difficult because the extracted record does not include verified removal totals, baseline method, or leakage treatment, all of which are central to over-crediting risk. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so eligibility-based marketing claims cannot be substantiated from the extracted record. The project is described as CO2 storage following Limenet technology (methodology version 001 – A), but without quantified accounting parameters, the risk of overstating climate impact remains elevated. Low extraction confidence further increases greenwashing risk because critical qualifiers may be missing.

Documentation — 2.4 / 10

- + Multiple document types are referenced (validation report, PDD, and a verification report dated 2025-04-17).
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, and several critical quantitative fields are missing from the extracted record.

The documentation set appears broad (six documents used, including a PDD and validation report, plus a verification report dated 2025-04-17), which is a positive sign of process coverage. However, minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable, and many core fields (baseline, additionality, leakage, reversals, and verified totals) are not captured in the extracted record. No safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, or benefit-sharing are indicated, suggesting either absence or missing documentation in the available materials. Overall, the record is not complete enough to support high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide readable excerpts (or re-OCR) from the PDD/validation/verification documents that explicitly state the additionality test applied and the baseline method (including when it was last reassessed).

→ Disclose quantified MRV outputs for the monitoring period, including total removals claimed and verified, leakage assessment (deduction and justification), and permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool or monitoring/contingency plan for reversals).

Documents Reviewed

- CM_Limenet_OAE Project_Info
- LM_V1_Methodology_Storage_rev.7.5
- PDD_Project_Design_Document_Limenet_Augusta_Stoccaggio_V7.1
- VERIFICATION REPORT_Rapporto_Ver_LIMENET_r2_24.03.2025
- Limenet Verification_RINA_Opinione_Verifica_Limenet_r1_ENGLISH
- OpinioneValidazioneLimenet_r1

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-253C54C9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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