QUALITY REPORT

# Freres Lumber Co., Inc.

PUR-133206 · Puro · United States

Report ID: CM-91F65604 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.0**

Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|---|---|
| Integrity (35%) | 4.6 |
| Transparency (25%) | 5.0 |
| Claim Safety (25%) | 5.4 |
| Documentation (15%) | 5.6 |

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

## Assessment Summary

This Puro biochar removal project has some structural integrity features (notably a stated 2.5% buffer pool) and a recent verification report, but key quantifications needed to judge over-crediting risk (verified removals, leakage treatment, and reversal history) are not present in the extracted record. Corrective actions in the verification indicate MRV/data handling issues that increase uncertainty around credited outcomes.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Registry | Puro |
| Registry ID | PUR-133206 |
| Sector | biomass |
| Country | United States |
| Vintage | 2023, 2024 |
| Project Methodology | Biochar Methodology Edition 2022 v3 v3 |
| Crediting Period | 2019 — 2025 |
| VVB | EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd |
| Monitoring Period | 2023 — 2024 |
| Confidence | High |
| Documents Reviewed | 9 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-02 |

## Red Flags

- ■ No verified or claimed removal totals were found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess over-crediting risk.
- ■ Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) was not found, despite biomass/biochar supply-chain leakage being potentially material.
- ■ Verification required corrective actions related to weight/moisture and an LCA data-year mix-up (mobile equipment hours swapped), indicating data quality weaknesses.
- ■ Safeguards reporting is inconsistent across documents (safeguards mentioned vs not mentioned), and FPIC/grievance mechanism are not evidenced.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.6 / 10

+ A buffer pool contribution of 2.5% is stated, which helps manage reversal risk for removals.

- Leakage and baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, and additionality is not confirmed by the VVB.

The verification record indicates an investment additionality test, but additionality is not confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, weakening additionality robustness. The baseline is described as project-specific, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, increasing baseline uncertainty. A 2.5% buffer pool contribution is stated, which supports permanence management, but reversal events (if any) are not found in the extracted record. Leakage deduction and leakage justification are also not found, leaving a key integrity component unquantified for a biomass/biochar pathway.

### Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ A named VVB (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) and a defined monitoring period (2023-09-01 to 2024-11-30) are provided.

- Claimed vs verified removal totals were not found, and key MRV elements (e.g., usage monitoring method) are not stated in the extracted record.

The verification report (2025-12-10) identifies the VVB as EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd and provides a clear monitoring period (2023-09-01 to 2024-11-30). However, neither total removals claimed nor total removals verified are found in the extracted record, preventing a basic reconciliation of issuance quantities to measured outcomes. Several MRV-relevant fields (e.g., usage monitoring method and any fossil/non-renewable biomass approach) are not stated in available documents. Corrective actions listed in the verification record suggest the audit process identified data issues that required fixes, which also reduces confidence in transparent, stable MRV.

### Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk cannot be well bounded because verified removals, leakage treatment, and reversal history are not found in the extracted record.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims being made from these credits. At the same time, CCP status is not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily infer alignment with ICVCM claims pathways. The verification record includes corrective actions related to weight correction, moisture content, and an LCA error where mobile equipment hours were swapped between years and the LCA initially used the wrong year’s data; these issues elevate over-crediting/quantification risk even if corrected. With no leakage deduction/justification and no verified removal total found in the extracted record, conservative claim-making is warranted.

### Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ The extracted record references 9 documents and includes a recent verification report dated 2025-12-10.

- Extraction confidence is only medium and there is an internal contradiction on safeguards, reducing reliability.

The extracted record indicates 9 documents were used and the primary cited document type is a verification report dated 2025-12-10, which supports recency. However, the evidence document list is not specific (listed as “unknown”), limiting traceability for third parties. Minimum extraction confidence is medium, implying some readability/coverage limitations and warranting a modest documentation penalty. The presence of multiple corrective actions in the verification record also suggests documentation/MRV needed remediation rather than being clean on first pass.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| ● **Additionality** | Investment test stated, but not VVB-confirmed in extracted record |
| ● **Permanence** | Buffer pool stated (2.5%), but reversal history not evidenced |
| ● **Leakage** | Leakage deduction/justification not found |
| ● **Baseline** | Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not evidenced |
| ● **Safeguards** | Safeguards inconsistently reported; no FPIC or grievance mechanism evidenced |
| ● **Double-claim** | Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and reconcile total removals claimed vs verified for the monitoring period, with clear calculation tables and uncertainty/QA-QC summaries.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment (justification and any deduction) for biomass sourcing, transport, and downstream effects, consistent with the Puro biochar methodology.

→ Publish clearer safeguards evidence (e.g., stakeholder engagement records, FPIC where relevant, and a functioning grievance mechanism) and resolve the safeguards inconsistency across documents.

## Documents Reviewed

- Description_FreresLumber.pdf
- 5HRdGI0bSEeNzK-Oa_EcAgo2932
- FreresLumber.pdf
- Audit_2025_FreresLumberCoInc_report.pdf
- Audit_2024_FreresLumber_Report.pdf
- Audit_2024_FreresLumber_Statement.pdf
- hA_3_9WfQn2wTSqE2tS41Ao1895
- Audit_2025_FreresLumberCoInc_statement.pdf
- zLPjBj5eTaGKxLTSArLP9wo1898



Report ID: CM-91F65604 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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