QUALITY REPORT

Walsenburg Facility

PUR-452184 · Puro · United States

Report ID: CM-54E600F7 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

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

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record suggests some core quality elements are present (investment additionality test is referenced; safeguards and a grievance mechanism are mentioned), but key quantifications needed to judge over-crediting risk are missing. With no extracted monitoring period, verified removals, leakage deduction value, or permanence/buffer details, confidence in the robustness of credited removals is limited.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-452184
Sector	biomass
Country	United States
Vintage	2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

■ No extracted figures for verified removals (no verified ERR) or monitoring period, limiting the ability to assess MRV quality and over-crediting risk.

■ Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

■ Permanence provisions (buffer pool percentage) and any reversal reporting are not found in the extracted record for a removal project.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ The methodology record indicates an investment additionality test and reports no material findings or corrective actions in the extracted documents.

- Key integrity parameters are missing from the extracted record, including permanence/buffer pool details, leakage deduction value, and any baseline reassessment timing.

The extracted record references an investment additionality test, but it is not confirmed by a VVB in the available extraction. The baseline is described as project-specific, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record. Leakage is said to be quantified, yet the actual leakage deduction (percent) is not found, and permanence provisions such as a buffer pool contribution are also not found. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted documents, but the absence of key quantified parameters limits integrity confidence.

Transparency — 3.6 / 10

+ Safeguards and a grievance mechanism are mentioned in the extracted documents, indicating some disclosure on social safeguards.

- Core MRV transparency items are not found in the extracted record (VVB name, monitoring period, and claimed vs verified removals).

Transparency is constrained because the extracted record does not include a VVB name, monitoring period, or any claimed versus verified removal totals. While safeguards are mentioned and both FPIC and a grievance mechanism are indicated in the extracted record, the evidence set is thin and not clearly identified (listed as “unknown”). The registry is listed as “other,” and CORSIA eligibility is not stated in the extracted record, limiting completeness for buyers.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is marked as CCP-approved, which can reduce some buyer-side reputational risk if the approval is current and applicable.

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because the extracted record lacks verified removals, leakage deduction value, and key baseline quantifications.

The project is marked as CCP-approved in the extracted record, which may support claim defensibility depending on the scope and recency of that approval. However, the extracted record lacks the verified removal quantity, leakage deduction value, and key baseline quantifications, making it difficult to rule out over-crediting. CORSIA eligibility is not stated in the extracted record, so aviation-claim implications cannot be assessed from the available data.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ Extraction confidence is high and the methodology version/date are identified (Edition 2023 v.1; 2023-11).

- Only two documents were used and the evidence document list is effectively unidentified (“unknown”), with no extracted VVB identity or monitoring/verification artifacts.

Documentation quality is moderate: the methodology version and date are captured (Edition 2023 v.1; 2023-11) and extraction confidence is high. However, only two documents were used and the evidence document list is not identifiable (shown as “unknown”), with no extracted monitoring/verification report details such as the VVB name, monitoring period, or verified removals. No corrective actions are reported, but the limited and non-specific document set reduces auditability.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	Investment test referenced; not VVB-confirmed in extracted record
● **Permanence**	Permanence/buffer provisions not found in extracted record
● **Leakage**	Leakage said to be quantified; deduction value not found
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not found
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism indicated
● **Double-claim**	CCP-approved; CORSIA eligibility not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the monitoring/verification report(s) showing the monitoring period, claimed vs verified removals, VVB identity, and any findings/corrective actions.

→ Disclose quantified leakage results including the leakage deduction percentage and the calculation basis, and publish permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool contribution and reversal management).

Documents Reviewed

- Puro Standard General Rules v3.1.pdf
- Terrestrial Storage of Biomass.pdf

Report ID: CM-54E600F7 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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