QUALITY REPORT

A. James - 50370 Brecey

PUR-181856 · Puro · France

Report ID: CM-659BC841 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.1 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	3.2
	Transparency (25%)	2.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.4
	Documentation (15%)	2.6

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

Assessment Summary

This Puro alternative materials project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period, but key integrity elements (baseline approach, additionality, leakage, and reversal treatment) were not found in the extracted record. With low extraction confidence and limited document coverage, the risk of over-crediting cannot be ruled out from the available evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-181856
Sector	biomass
Country	France
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	Puro CO2 Removal Marketplace General Rules 2.0
VVB	DNV – Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Baseline approach and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in credited removals.
- ■ Additionality test and whether it was confirmed by the VVB were not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) was not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Low extraction confidence and evidence documents listed as “unknown” reduce reliability and auditability of the extracted facts.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

- Baseline method, additionality assessment, and leakage treatment were not found in the extracted record (verification report dated 2022-08-27 referenced).

~ A 10% buffer pool is reported, but reversal events and how permanence is managed were not found in the extracted record.

The extracted verification record (dated 2022-08-27) reports a 10% buffer pool, which is a positive structural feature for managing reversal risk. However, the baseline method, any baseline reassessment date, additionality test type, and whether additionality was confirmed by the VVB were not found in the extracted record. Leakage is also not evidenced (no deduction percentage and no justification found), and reversal events were not found, leaving permanence and leakage controls insufficiently supported by the available evidence.

Transparency — 2.8 / 10

+ The verification record identifies the VVB (DNV – Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab) and specifies the monitoring period (2021-01-01 to 2021-12-31).

- Claimed vs verified removals were not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

The verification record names the VVB (DNV – Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab) and provides a clear monitoring period (2021-01-01—2021-12-31). At the same time, the extracted record does not include claimed or verified total removals for the period, nor key methodological parameters (e.g., baseline and leakage), which limits third-party reproducibility. The registry is listed as “other,” and the evidence documents are not clearly identified, reducing public traceability.

Claim Safety — 3.4 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.

~ No material findings or corrective actions were reported in the verification record, but the underlying quantified results were not found in the extracted record.

Because the extracted record does not include the claimed versus verified removal totals, it is difficult to assess over-crediting risk from the available evidence. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily determine whether credits might be used across multiple claim frameworks. While the verification record reports no material findings and no corrective actions, the absence of quantified outcomes and key assumptions in the extracted facts keeps claim risk elevated.

Documentation — 2.6 / 10

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable.

- Only two documents were used and the evidence document list is “unknown,” limiting traceability.

Documentation quality is constrained by low extraction confidence, suggesting at least one key source was poorly readable. Only two documents were used, and the evidence document list is “unknown,” which prevents clear linkage back to specific official files. Although a verification report date (2022-08-27) is provided, several core fields typically expected in verification/monitoring documentation were not found in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Additionality assessment not found
Permanence	10% buffer pool stated; reversals not evidenced
Leakage	Leakage deduction/justification not found
Baseline	Baseline method not found
Safeguards	FPIC/safeguards/grievance not evidenced
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full verification and monitoring documentation (with readable tables) showing baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage assessment (including any deduction), and the claimed vs verified removal totals for 2021.

→ Disclose safeguards evidence (FPIC where relevant, grievance mechanism, benefit-sharing) and clarify CCP/CORSIA status and registry traceability (public links, issuance/retirement records).

Documents Reviewed

- Brecey.pdf
- Description_James.pdf
- Puro_Registration_AJames50370Brecey.pdf

Report ID: CM-659BC841 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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