

QUALITY REPORT

Restoration Fuels

PUR-371935 · Puro · United States

Report ID: CM-04F4AB97 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	3.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
■ Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record indicates additionality was assessed using an investment test and confirmed by a VVB, and safeguards elements (FPIC and a grievance mechanism) are mentioned. However, key quantification and MRV fields (verified removals, monitoring period, leakage deduction value, permanence/buffer provisions, and methodology identification) are missing from the available extracted documents, limiting confidence in crediting accuracy.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-371935
Sector	biomass
Country	United States
Vintage	2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No verified or claimed removal totals were found in the extracted record, preventing an assessment of over-crediting risk.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not provided in the extracted record.
- Permanence risk management information (buffer pool and any reversal events) is not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The methodology document indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test.
- Baseline is project-specific and key integrity controls (buffer pool, reversals, leakage deduction value) are not found in the extracted record.

The methodology document indicates additionality was assessed via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. The baseline approach is project-specific, and the extracted record does not include when (or whether) the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens baseline credibility. Although leakage is described as quantified in the methodology document, the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, and permanence controls (buffer pool percentage and any reversal events) are also not found.

Transparency — 3.8 / 10

- + The methodology document date and version are provided (2024-02-01; 2022 V3).
- Core MRV/registry fields (VVB name, monitoring period, claimed vs verified removals, usage monitoring method) are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record lacks the monitoring period, any claimed or verified removal totals, and the VVB name, all of which are central to MRV traceability. The methodology version and document date are provided (2022 V3; 2024-02-01), but the evidence document list is not specific (listed as "unknown"), reducing auditability. With no claimed-versus-verified figures available, it is not possible to evaluate quantification accuracy from the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- + Leakage is at least described as quantified in the methodology document.
- CORSIA/CCP status and the project's verified removal numbers are not found in the extracted record, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting uncertainty.

Claim safety is constrained by missing eligibility and quantification signals: CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily gauge alignment with higher-integrity labels. Over-crediting risk cannot be assessed because neither claimed nor verified removals are provided. Leakage treatment is directionally positive (described as quantified in the methodology document), but without the deduction value it is unclear how conservatively leakage was handled.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

- + Extraction confidence is high and no material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record.
- Evidence documentation is thin/unclear (only 2 documents used and evidence docs listed as "unknown").

Documentation quality is moderate: extraction confidence is high and the extracted record reports no material findings or corrective actions, which is a positive signal. However, only two documents were used and the evidence document identifiers are not specific ("unknown"), limiting traceability to official sources. Several key fields typically found in verification/monitoring reports (monitoring period, VVB name, verified totals) are not found in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Permanence controls not evidenced
● Leakage	Quantified but deduction not shown
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism stated
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verification/monitoring report(s) showing the monitoring period and the claimed vs verified removal totals, including any uncertainty/discounting applied.

→ Disclose permanence risk management details (buffer pool contribution, monitoring duration, and any reversal provisions/events) and the quantified leakage deduction percentage with calculation references.

Documents Reviewed

- Puro Standard General Rules v3.1.pdf
- Puro.earth Biochar Methodology.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-04F4AB97 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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