QUALITY REPORT

Farm Gai Kaisa 159

PUR-226049 · Puro · Namibia

Report ID: CM-9655FB2D · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.0 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	4.2
	Transparency (25%)	3.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.8
	Documentation (15%)	4.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record suggests a project-specific baseline and an investment additionality test, with safeguards elements (FPIC and a grievance mechanism) mentioned. However, key MRV and crediting details (monitoring period, verified removals, leakage deduction value, buffer/reversal provisions, and verifier identity) are not found in the available documents, limiting confidence in credit quality claims.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-226049
Sector	biomass
Country	Namibia
Vintage	2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No verified removal volume or monitoring period found in the extracted record, preventing assessment of MRV performance.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not provided in the extracted record.
- No information found on buffer pool contribution or reversal events for a removal project, leaving permanence risk unclear.
- Verifier (VVB) name and whether additionality was confirmed by a VVB are not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ The methodology record indicates an investment additionality test and a quantified approach to leakage.

- Permanence and leakage implementation are not verifiable from the extracted record (no buffer pool percentage, reversal information, or leakage deduction value).

The methodology record (dated 2024-02-01) indicates an investment additionality test and that leakage is treated via a quantified approach. However, the extracted record does not include the leakage deduction percentage, any buffer pool contribution, or any reversal events information, which are central to permanence and net-removal integrity for a removal project. The baseline is described as project-specific, and there is no information on when (or whether) the baseline was last reassessed.

Transparency — 3.6 / 10

+ Safeguards elements are referenced (FPIC and a grievance mechanism).

- Core MRV transparency is missing (no monitoring period, no claimed vs verified removals, no usage monitoring method, and no VVB identified).

The extracted record lacks basic monitoring and verification transparency: no monitoring period is provided and neither claimed nor verified removal totals are available. The verifier (VVB) name is not found, and there is no indication in the extracted record that additionality was confirmed by a VVB. While FPIC and a grievance mechanism are mentioned, the absence of MRV details materially limits transparency.

Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

+ No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record.

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline is project-specific and key quantifications (verified removals and leakage deduction) are not found.

Because the extracted record does not provide verified removals, leakage deduction percentage, or monitoring methods, the risk of over-crediting cannot be meaningfully evaluated. The baseline is project-specific, which typically requires strong, well-documented justification to reduce greenwashing risk, but that justification is not available in the extracted record beyond the baseline type. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims screening.

Documentation — 4.8 / 10

+ Extraction confidence is high and two documents were used, with a recent methodology date (2024-02-01).

- Evidence documents are not clearly identified (listed as "unknown"), and critical project/verification artifacts are not present in the extracted record.

Only two documents were used and the evidence list is not specific (shown as "unknown"), suggesting incomplete document coverage even though extraction confidence is high. The record includes a recent methodology version (2022 V3) and a methodology date (2024-02-01), but it does not include key project documents such as a monitoring report, verification statement, or registry issuance/retirement details. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, but without the underlying verification documentation this provides limited assurance.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Investment test stated; VVB confirmation not found
Permanence	Removal permanence provisions not evidenced (buffer/reversal info missing)
Leakage	Leakage said to be quantified; deduction value not found
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not found
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism mentioned
Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring report and verification statement showing the monitoring period, claimed vs verified removals, and any material findings/corrective actions, including the VVB name.

→ Disclose quantified leakage results (leakage deduction percentage and justification) and permanence provisions (buffer pool contribution and any reversal monitoring/response procedures).

Documents Reviewed

- Puro Standard General Rules v3.1.pdf
- Puro.earth Biochar Methodology.pdf

Report ID: CM-9655FB2D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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