

## QUALITY REPORT

# Four Bordet

PUR-619736 · PUR · France

Report ID: CM-4AEF9CE9 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 3.9

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.6
■ Documentation (15%)	3.2

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

## Assessment Summary

This PUR biochar removal project has some integrity positives (additionality is stated as VVB-confirmed via an investment test), but key quantification elements for robust crediting are missing in the extracted record (baseline approach, leakage treatment, and verified removals). A long list of corrective actions in the verification report and low document readability reduce confidence and increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

## Project Details

Registry	PUR
Registry ID	PUR-619736
Sector	other
Country	France
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	Biochar Methodology Edition 2022 v3 v3
Crediting Period	2023 — 2024
VVB	EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2025
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Leakage is marked as not addressed, with no leakage deduction or justification captured in the extracted record.
- No verified removals figure is available in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess over-crediting risk.
- Verification report lists numerous corrective actions (emission factors, supplier distances, moisture content, gas consumption, production records, LCA revisions), indicating material MRV weaknesses at the time of verification.
- Contradictory crediting period dates across documents undermine timeline clarity and data reliability.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key document was poorly readable.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ The verification report confirms additionality using an investment test.

- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record and the baseline approach is not stated, weakening the core accounting framework.

The verification report (2026-01-28) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports additionality. However, the extracted record does not state the baseline method or when it was last reassessed, and leakage is marked as not addressed with no leakage deduction captured. The same verification report includes many corrective actions related to emission factors, supplier distances, moisture content, gas use, production records, and LCA revisions, which weakens confidence in the robustness of quantified removals.

### Transparency — 4.0 / 10

+ A named VVB (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) and a defined monitoring period (2024-05-01 to 2025-04-30) are provided in the verification report.

- Claimed vs verified removals are not available in the extracted record, and low extraction confidence reduces transparency of MRV details.

The verification report (2026-01-28) provides a named VVB (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) and specifies a monitoring period of 2024-05-01 to 2025-04-30. But the extracted record does not include total removals claimed or verified, preventing a basic reconciliation of issuance quantities. Low extraction confidence further suggests that some MRV details may be missing or unreliable in the extracted record.

### Claim Safety — 3.6 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims and eligibility-based marketing.

- Multiple corrective actions in the verification report (including LCA revisions and activity data issues) elevate over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Because the extracted record lacks the verified removals total and does not state the baseline method or leakage treatment, there is elevated risk that credited removals could be overstated. The verification report (2026-01-28) lists corrective actions including revising the LCA to include end-use and aligning LCA/Bilan Carbon with the validation period, which directly affects claim defensibility. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so eligibility-based claims cannot be safely inferred.

### Documentation — 3.2 / 10

+ The extracted record indicates 9 documents were used overall.

- Evidence document list is not specific (shown as “unknown”) and minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing document reliability.

Although the extracted record indicates 9 documents were used, the evidence document list is not specific (listed as “unknown”), limiting auditability of what was actually reviewed. Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable, which reduces confidence that all critical parameters were captured. The verification report (2026-01-28) also includes numerous corrective actions, suggesting documentation and data packages were incomplete or inconsistent at the time of assessment.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed investment test
● <b>Permanence</b>	Reversal/buffer details not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards mentioned but key elements missing
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/clarify the baseline approach and leakage assessment (including any quantified leakage deduction and justification) in the project documentation and registry entry.

→ Disclose claimed vs verified removals for the monitoring period and provide a clear reconciliation to issuance, including how corrective actions were closed.

→ Resolve the crediting-period date contradiction with a definitive registry record and consistent dates across validation/verification documents.

## Documents Reviewed

- Description\_FourBordet.pdf
- \_FourBordet\_statement.pdf
- Audit\_2024\_FourBordet\_statement.pdf
- Statement\_MP3.pdf
- \_FourBordet\_report.pdf
- Additionality\_FourBordet.pdf
- Puro\_registration\_FourBordet.pdf
- Report\_MP3.pdf
- Audit\_2024\_FourBordet\_report.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-4AEF9CE9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy