

QUALITY REPORT

Glanris Colusa

PUR-100301 · Puro Standard · United States

Report ID: CM-0A402347 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This biochar removal project has some basic third-party validation information available, but key integrity-critical elements (additionality approach, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and reversal/buffer provisions) were not found in the extracted record. With limited quantified MRV outputs (no verified removals figure captured) and missing eligibility/status fields, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims control remains moderate-to-high based on evidence gaps.

Project Details

Registry	Puro Standard
Registry ID	PUR-100301
Sector	biomass
Country	United States
Vintage	2025, 2026
Project Methodology	Biochar Methodology v2.6.1
VVB	EnergyLink Services
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Additionality approach and whether it was confirmed by the validator were not found in the extracted record.
- Baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record.
- Leakage deduction and justification were not found in the extracted record.
- No verified total removals/ERR figure was found in the extracted record for the stated monitoring period.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ The validation report (2023) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.

- Additionality, baseline, leakage, and reversal/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in environmental integrity.

The validation report (2023) indicates no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is a positive signal on process quality. However, the extracted record does not show the additionality test used or whether additionality was confirmed by the validator, and it also lacks the baseline method and any reassessment timing. Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) and reversal risk management (buffer pool or any reversal events) were not found in the extracted record, so integrity must be scored conservatively given these evidence gaps.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ A validator is identified (EnergyLink Services) and a monitoring period is specified (2021-04-01 to 2022-08-31).

- Key quantified MRV outputs (claimed vs verified removals) and monitoring details (e.g., usage monitoring method) were not found in the extracted record.

The extracted record identifies the validator (EnergyLink Services) and provides a defined monitoring period (2021-04-01 to 2022-08-31), supporting basic traceability. But no claimed or verified total removals/ERR values were found in the extracted record, preventing a check of issuance quantities against monitored outcomes. Key MRV descriptors such as the usage monitoring method were also not found in the extracted record, reducing transparency on how permanence and end-use were ensured for biochar.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

~ The project is a removal activity under a biochar methodology (v2.6.1), which can be robust, but the extracted record lacks the parameters needed to judge conservativeness.

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, and over-crediting controls (baseline/leakage/reversal provisions) are not evidenced here.

Because the extracted record does not include baseline setting, leakage assumptions, or reversal/buffer provisions, it is not possible to assess whether crediting is conservative, which elevates over-crediting and greenwashing risk. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on those labels to reduce reputational risk. The absence of extracted claimed-versus-verified removals figures further limits confidence that public claims can be tied to verified quantities for the stated monitoring period.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

+ Two core documents are present (PDD and validation report dated 2023-02-20) with medium extraction confidence.

- Only two documents were used and several core fields are missing from the extracted record, indicating incomplete documentary coverage for scoring.

Documentation coverage is partial: only a PDD and a validation report (dated 2023-02-20) are listed, and extraction confidence is medium. While the validation report shows a clean outcome (no material findings and no corrective actions), many critical quantitative and methodological fields were not found in the extracted record. This suggests either the documents do not contain these details in extractable form or additional documents (e.g., monitoring/verification and issuance records) were not available in the evidence set used here.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced in extracted record
● Permanence	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring/verification report and registry issuance records showing claimed and verified removals for 2021-04-01 to 2022-08-31, including uncertainty and any adjustments.

→ Disclose and clearly document the additionality demonstration, baseline approach, leakage assessment (with any deduction), and reversal risk management (e.g., buffer contribution and monitoring) in publicly accessible project documentation.

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-0A402347 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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