QUALITY REPORT

Igloo Cellulose Inc.

PUR-123804 · Puro · Canada

Report ID: CM-025E3EDB · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.0 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	3.2
	Transparency (25%)	2.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.4
	Documentation (15%)	2.6

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

Assessment Summary

This Puro.earth bio-based construction materials project has very limited extractable evidence on core integrity items like additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and quantified verified removals. While a verification report dated 2022-12-31 is referenced and no material findings or corrective actions are recorded, the low readability/extraction confidence and missing key quantitative fields materially weaken confidence in credit quality.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-123804
Sector	other
Country	Canada
Vintage	2022
Project Methodology	puro.earth CO2 Removal Marketplace General Rules 2.6.1– Bio-based Construction Materials Methodology
Crediting Period	2020 — 2022
VVB	bio.inspecta AG
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Additionality approach and whether the VVB confirmed it are not stated in the extracted record.
- Baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents.
- Leakage deduction and justification are not stated in available documents.
- No extracted figures for claimed or verified net removals (ERR), limiting the ability to assess over-crediting risk.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and reversal/buffer provisions are not stated in the extracted record (verification report dated 2022-12-31 referenced).

+ The verification report record shows no material findings and no corrective actions required.

The project is tagged to the Puro.earth Bio-based Construction Materials methodology, but the extracted record does not state the additionality test used or whether additionality was confirmed by the VVB (verification report dated 2022-12-31 referenced). The baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents, and leakage deduction/justification are also not found in the extracted record. No material findings or corrective actions are recorded in the verification report record, which is a positive signal but not sufficient to compensate for missing core integrity parameters.

Transparency — 2.6 / 10

+ A VVB is identified (bio.inspecta AG) and a verification report date is provided (2022-12-31).

- Monitoring period and quantified claimed/verified removals are not stated in available documents, limiting MRV transparency.

A verifier is named (bio.inspecta AG) and a verification report date is provided (2022-12-31), which supports basic traceability. However, the monitoring period is not stated in the extracted record, and neither claimed nor verified removals (ERR) are available, preventing an external reader from checking MRV outcomes. The evidence document is listed as unknown and extraction confidence is low, further reducing transparency and auditability.

Claim Safety — 3.4 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because claimed vs verified removals, baseline method, and leakage treatment are not stated in the extracted record.

~ CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, leaving eligibility/labeling risk unresolved.

Because the extracted record lacks claimed and verified ERR values, it is not possible to assess whether issuance aligns with measured outcomes or to check for discrepancies that often signal over-crediting risk. Baseline and leakage information are not stated in available documents, which are central to assessing whether removals are conservatively quantified under an alternative materials approach. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about how credits might be marketed and the associated greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 2.6 / 10

- Minimum extraction confidence is low and the evidence document is listed as unknown, reducing reliability of the extracted record.

~ Only three documents were used and key fields (monitoring period, ERR, safeguards) are missing despite a verification report being referenced.

Although three documents were used and a verification report is referenced, the evidence document list is effectively non-specific (listed as unknown). Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable, which undermines confidence that missing fields are truly absent rather than unreadable. Key items typically expected in verification/monitoring documentation (monitoring period, quantified results, safeguards/grievance details) are not captured in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Additionality test not found
Permanence	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
Baseline	Baseline method not found
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or provide readable copies of the verification and monitoring documentation with explicit sections on additionality, baseline setting, leakage assessment, and permanence/reversal provisions (including any buffer contribution).

→ Disclose quantified claimed and verified net removals for the monitoring period(s), including calculation inputs (e.g., usage monitoring method, assumptions vs verified values) and any uncertainty/adjustments applied by the VVB.

Documents Reviewed

- Puro_Registration_IglooCelluloseInc.pdf
- Audit_2022_IglooCelluloseInc_statement.pdf
- Audit_2022_IglooCelluloseInc_statement2.pdf

Report ID: CM-025E3EDB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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