

QUALITY REPORT

Lapwall Factory 2

PUR-329175 · Puro · Finland

Report ID: CM-B99A464E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.3

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
■ Documentation (15%)	4.8

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

Assessment Summary

This Puro Alternative Materials project has some credibility signals (independent VVB named, no material findings, and a stated 10% buffer), but key integrity elements are missing from the extracted record. In particular, additionality, baseline approach, and leakage treatment are not stated in the available documents, which increases over-crediting risk and limits confidence in claims.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-329175
Sector	other
Country	Finland
Vintage	2021, 2022
Project Methodology	Puro CO2 Removal Marketplace Methodology 2.0
VVB	DNV – Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
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 the extracted record.
- Leakage deduction and justification are not stated in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ The verification report (2021-09-20) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.

- Additionality, baseline, and leakage treatment are not stated in the extracted record, weakening confidence in the credited removals.

The verification report (2021-09-20) indicates no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports procedural integrity. However, the extracted record does not state the additionality test used, whether additionality was confirmed by the VVB, the baseline method, or any leakage deduction/justification. A 10% buffer pool is reported, but reversal events are not stated in the extracted record, limiting assessment of permanence risk handling.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The VVB is identified as DNV – Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab and a monitoring period is provided (2020-01-01 to 2021-06-30).

- Key MRV outputs (claimed vs verified removals) and key parameters (e.g., usage monitoring and fossil/non-fossil split method) are not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency is moderate because the VVB is clearly identified (DNV – Business Assurance Finland Oy Ab) and the monitoring period is specified (2020-01-01—2021-06-30). At the same time, the extracted record does not provide claimed or verified total removals for the period, nor key quantification elements such as the fossil/non-fossil determination method or usage monitoring approach. The evidence document list is not informative ("unknown"), reducing traceability.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

+ The project is marked CCP-eligible, which can reduce reputational risk if substantiated by the program's governance.

- CORSIA eligibility is not stated and core over-crediting controls (baseline, leakage, additionality) are not stated in the extracted record.

Claim safety is constrained by missing core quantification and eligibility details: CORSIA eligibility is not stated in the extracted record, and baseline/leakage/additionality information is also not stated. The project is marked as CCP-eligible, which is a positive signal, but without the underlying baseline and leakage disclosures it remains difficult to rule out over-crediting risk. The absence of reported material findings in the verification report (2021-09-20) helps, but does not substitute for missing methodological specifics.

Documentation — 4.8 / 10

+ A dated verification report is present (2021-09-20) and two documents were used with medium extraction confidence.

- Evidence document list is incomplete/unclear (listed as "unknown"), and several critical fields are not stated in the extracted record.

Documentation quality is mid-range: there is a specific verification report date (2021-09-20) and two documents were used, with medium extraction confidence. However, many critical fields (additionality, baseline, leakage, quantified results) are not stated in the extracted record, and the evidence document list is effectively missing ("unknown"). No corrective actions are listed in the verification report, which supports completeness of that specific audit outcome but not overall data completeness.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced
● Permanence	Buffer stated (10%), reversals not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CCP-eligible; CORSIA status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and cite the additionality assessment (test type and explicit VVB confirmation) and the baseline method used under the Puro methodology.

→ Publish the monitoring/verification quantification outputs for the period (claimed and verified removals) and the leakage approach (deduction and justification), including the fossil/non-fossil determination method and usage monitoring method.

Documents Reviewed

- Audit_2021_LapwallFactory2.pdf
- Puro_Registration_LapwallFactory2.pdf
- Description_Lapwall.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-B99A464E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy