QUALITY REPORT

Red Trail Energy LLC

PUR-353054 · Puro · United States

Report ID: CM-BD53D5E8 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	4.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.1
	Documentation (15%)	3.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some integrity positives, including VVB-confirmed additionality via an investment test and no reported reversals in the verification record. However, key baseline and leakage elements are missing or inconsistently reported across documents, and multiple contradictions (including the verified removals figure) materially weaken confidence in the credited outcome.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-353054
Sector	dac
Country	United States
Vintage	2023
Project Methodology	Geologically Stored Carbon Methodology 2021
Crediting Period	2022 — 2027
VVB	350Solutions, Inc.
Verified ERs	29,475.7 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2025 — 2025
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Verified and claimed removals conflict across documents (29,475.74 vs 42,631), creating over-crediting risk.
- ■ Baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, limiting assessment of baseline validity and conservativeness.
- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents ("not addressed" vs "deemed negligible") and no leakage deduction is provided.
- ■ Safeguards and stakeholder provisions are contradictory (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing), increasing social integrity uncertainty.
- ■ Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, reducing reliability of extracted facts.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The verification report (2025-12-18) confirms additionality using an investment test and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline method and baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage is not clearly treated (no deduction and inconsistent justification).

The verification report (2025-12-18) confirms additionality via an investment test and reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports procedural integrity. Permanence risk is described as unlikely and no reversals are reported in the extracted verification record, but there is no buffer pool percentage stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in long-term risk management. Baseline validity cannot be assessed because the baseline method and any baseline reassessment date are not stated in the extracted record. Leakage is a major gap: the extracted record shows leakage is not addressed and provides no leakage deduction, and other documents contradict this by calling leakage negligible.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ A VVB is identified (350Solutions, Inc.) and a specific monitoring period is provided (2025-10-01 to 2025-11-30).

- Key public-accounting elements are unclear or inconsistent, including conflicting ERR figures and missing baseline/leakage details; extraction confidence is low.

The extracted record identifies the VVB (350Solutions, Inc.), provides a monitoring period (2025-10-01—2025-11-30), and includes a dated verification report (2025-12-18). However, transparency is weakened by conflicting removals totals across documents and by missing core MRV descriptors such as the baseline method and any usage monitoring method in the extracted record. The evidence document list is not traceable (listed as "unknown"), and the minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key source was hard to read and increasing uncertainty in the extracted dataset.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

+ Claimed and verified removals match within the 2025-12-18 verification record (29,475.74), suggesting internal consistency in that document.

- Contradictory ERR totals across documents (29,475.74 vs 42,631) and missing baseline/leakage quantification increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk; CORSIA/CCP status is not stated.

Within the 2025-12-18 verification record, claimed and verified removals are the same (29,475.74), which would normally reduce over-crediting concerns for that specific issuance. But a separate document dated 2025-11-27 reports a much higher figure (42,631) for both claimed and verified removals, creating a material risk that public claims could reference the higher number. Baseline and leakage are not adequately evidenced in the extracted record (baseline method not stated; leakage not addressed/no deduction), which increases the risk that credited removals are overstated. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about how credits might be marketed and perceived.

Documentation — 3.2 / 10

+ The extracted record includes a dated verification report (2025-12-18) and indicates 12 documents were used.

- Evidence document naming is not provided (listed as "unknown") and minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating documentation usability/traceability issues.

The extracted record indicates 12 documents were used and includes a recent verification report date (2025-12-18), which is a positive for recency. However, the evidence document identifiers are not provided (shown as "unknown"), limiting auditability and third-party traceability. Minimum extraction confidence is low, meaning at least one key document was poorly readable; this reduces confidence in the completeness and accuracy of extracted facts. Contradictions across documents on core fields (ERR totals and safeguards items) further indicate documentation control/versioning issues.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No reversals reported, but buffer not evidenced
● **Leakage**	Leakage not clearly addressed/quantified
● **Baseline**	Baseline method not evidenced
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards claims contradictory; FPIC/grievance unclear
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish and clearly reference the baseline approach (including assumptions, data sources, and any reassessment schedule) in the verification/monitoring package and registry entry.

→ Provide a consistent, documented leakage assessment (quantified or justified negligible) and apply an explicit leakage deduction where appropriate, with the same conclusion across all project documents.

→ Resolve and publicly clarify the ERR discrepancy (29,475.74 vs 42,631) with version control and an issuance/verification reconciliation note.

Documents Reviewed

• Dakota_353054.pdf
• Description_RedTrailEnergyLLC.pdf
• Additionality_RedTrailEnergyLLC.pdf
• Audit_2024_RedTrailEnergyLLC_Statement.pdf
• Report_MP5.pdf
• Audit_2023_RedTrailEnergyLLC_Statement.pdf
• Statement_MP5.pdf
• Puro_Registration_RedTrailEnergyLLC.pdf
• Audit_2023_RedTrailEnergyLLC_Report.pdf
• Audit_2024_RedTrailEnergyLLC_Report.pdf
• Audit_2025_GevoNorthDakota_report.pdf
• Audit_2025_GevoNorthDakota_statement.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-BD53D5E8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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