

QUALITY REPORT

Are Treindustrier, Norway

PUR-310958 · Puro · Norway

Report ID: CM-B81896EE · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.7

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	3.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
■ Documentation (15%)	2.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project is verified under Puro's CO2 Removal Marketplace Methodology v2.0 with DNV as the VVB, and the verification report (2022-12-22) reports no material findings or corrective actions. However, key integrity and MRV elements (additionality test, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and verified removals) were not found in the extracted record, and document readability was low, which materially increases uncertainty and over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-310958
Sector	biomass
Country	Norway
Vintage	2021, 2022
Project Methodology	Puro CO2 Removal Marketplace Methodology 2.0
VVB	DNV – Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Additionality approach and whether the VVB confirmed it were not found in the extracted record.
- Baseline method and any reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in counterfactual validity.
- Leakage deduction and justification were not found in the extracted record.
- Claimed and verified net removals were not found in the extracted record, preventing a basic cross-check of issuance quantities.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- + A 10% buffer contribution is stated, which can help manage reversal risk (verification report, 2022-12-22).
- Additionality, baseline, and leakage treatment were not found in the extracted record, weakening confidence in environmental integrity.

The verification report (2022-12-22) indicates a 10% buffer contribution, which is a positive signal for managing reversal risk. No reversal events were found in the extracted record, but this absence is not confirmatory given the low extraction confidence. Core integrity elements—additionality test type, whether the VVB confirmed additionality, baseline method and reassessment timing, and leakage deduction/justification—were not found in the extracted record, so the integrity score is constrained by evidence gaps.

Transparency — 3.0 / 10

- + The VVB is identified as DNV – Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab and a monitoring period is specified (verification report, 2022-12-22).
- Claimed vs verified removals and key MRV parameters (e.g., usage monitoring method) were not found in the extracted record.

The verification report (2022-12-22) clearly identifies the VVB (DNV) and specifies the monitoring period (2021-04-01 to 2022-03-31). However, the extracted record does not include claimed or verified net removals, nor the monitoring/usage tracking approach, which limits third-party ability to reproduce or sanity-check results. The evidence document reference is non-specific (“unknown”), reducing auditability of the underlying sources.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

- + Independent verification is indicated by the presence of a VVB-issued verification report (2022-12-22).
- Eligibility/status for CCP and CORSIA were not found in the extracted record, and removals quantities were not available to assess over-crediting risk.

Because both claimed and verified removal totals were not found in the extracted record, over-crediting risk cannot be screened using basic consistency checks. CCP status and CORSIA eligibility were also not found in the extracted record, so downstream claims (e.g., compliance-grade or high-integrity labels) cannot be substantiated from the available data. While the presence of a VVB verification report (2022-12-22) helps, the missing baseline/additionality/leakage details keep claim safety in the mid-low range.

Documentation — 2.6 / 10

- + Four documents were used in extraction and a dated verification report is present (2022-12-22).
- Minimum extraction confidence is low and the evidence document list is not specific (listed as “unknown”), indicating weak document traceability.

A verification report dated 2022-12-22 is present and no material findings or corrective actions are reported there, which is a positive documentation signal. Nonetheless, minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the chance that important requirements are simply not captured. The evidence document list is not traceable (shown as “unknown”), and several critical fields are missing from the extracted record, so documentation completeness is weak.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced in extracted record
● Permanence	10% buffer stated; reversals not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance/safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CCP/CORSIA status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or provide extractable sections from the PDD/monitoring report that explicitly state the additionality test applied and the VVB's conclusion on additionality.

→ Disclose the baseline approach (including reassessment timing) and leakage assessment (deduction and justification), and report claimed vs verified net removals for the monitoring period to enable basic consistency checks.

Documents Reviewed

- Puro_Registration_AreTreindustrierNorway.pdf
- Norway.pdf
- Description_AreTreindustrierNorway.pdf

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-B81896EE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy