

QUALITY REPORT

UNDO enhanced rock weathering

PUR-100240 · Puro Standard · Canada

Report ID: CM-E42B20F0 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.0

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	3.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.6
■ Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record indicates an investment-test additionality argument and mentions safeguards with FPIC, but key quantifications needed to judge ERW credit integrity (baseline approach, leakage treatment, monitoring period, and verified removals) are not present. With only a validation report and PDD available in the extracted set and no verification/issuance figures captured, the risk of over-crediting cannot be confidently ruled out.

Project Details

Registry	Puro Standard
Registry ID	PUR-100240
Sector	dac
Country	Canada
Vintage	2025, 2026, 2027, 2028
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No baseline method or baseline reassessment timing found in the extracted record, which is central to ERW removal quantification.
- No leakage deduction or leakage justification found in the extracted record.
- No monitoring period and no claimed vs verified removal totals found, limiting MRV transparency and over-crediting risk assessment.
- No VVB name and no confirmation that additionality was verified by the VVB found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ The validation documentation indicates an investment-test additionality approach, and no material findings or corrective actions were reported in the validation report.

- Baseline approach, leakage treatment, buffer/reversal provisions, and any verified removal quantities were not found in the extracted record.

The extracted record shows an investment-test additionality argument, but it is not clear from the extracted data whether the VVB explicitly confirmed additionality in the validation report. For ERW, integrity hinges on the baseline and quantification approach, yet no baseline method or reassessment timing is captured from the PDD/validation report. Leakage and permanence-related provisions are also not evidenced in the extracted record (no leakage deduction/justification, no buffer pool percentage, and no reversal reporting), which materially weakens confidence in the robustness of credited removals.

Transparency — 3.8 / 10

+ Two core documents (PDD and validation report) are present in the extracted set.

- Monitoring period, VVB identity, and claimed-versus-verified removal totals were not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record does not include a monitoring period, any claimed removals, or any verified removals, so readers cannot reconcile what was monitored versus what was credited. The VVB name is also not captured, reducing traceability of independent assurance. While the PDD and validation report are present, the absence of key MRV fields in the extracted record constrains public auditability.

Claim Safety — 3.6 / 10

+ Safeguards are mentioned and FPIC is indicated in the extracted record.

- CORSIA/CCP status and key quantification inputs (baseline and leakage) were not found, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the lack of extracted evidence on the baseline method and leakage treatment, both of which are central drivers of over-crediting risk in ERW. The extracted record does indicate safeguards are mentioned and that FPIC was conducted, which helps reduce social-risk-related greenwashing. However, CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about how credits might be marketed and whether additional eligibility claims could be made.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

+ The extracted set includes a PDD and a validation report, and extraction confidence is medium.

- Document date, VVB name, monitoring/crediting period details, and several core quantification fields were not found in the extracted record.

Documentation completeness is moderate: only two document types (PDD and validation report) are in the extracted set, and the document date is not captured. Extraction confidence is medium, which supports some reliance on the record but still suggests potential missing details. The absence of key fields (VVB name, monitoring/crediting period, baseline/leakage quantifications) indicates either gaps in the underlying documents or incomplete extraction, both of which reduce documentation quality for due diligence.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test stated; VVB confirmation not evidenced in extracted record
● Permanence	No buffer/reversal provisions evidenced in extracted record
● Leakage	No leakage deduction or justification evidenced in extracted record
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced in extracted record
● Safeguards	FPIC indicated; grievance/benefit-sharing not evidenced in extracted record
● Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not evidenced in extracted record

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide (or extract) the ERW quantification details from the PDD/methodology: baseline approach, leakage sources and any deduction, and how uncertainty is handled.

→ Add the monitoring/verification package and registry issuance data: monitoring period, claimed vs verified removals, VVB identity, and any non-conformities/corrective actions.

Documents Reviewed

- 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-E42B20F0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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