QUALITY REPORT

Leeds Production Facility

PUR-625222 · Puro · United Kingdom

Report ID: CM-45247D3D · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.2
Transparency (25%)	5.0
Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality (investment test) and no reversals reported, but key integrity elements like leakage treatment and baseline reassessment timing are not evidenced in the extracted record. Multiple cross-document inconsistencies—especially in verified removals—raise reliability and over-crediting risk, and the VVB required corrections to the fossil CO_2 subtraction and marketing disclaimers.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-625222
Sector	other
Country	United Kingdom
Vintage	2022, 2023
Project Methodology	Carbonated Building Material Methodology 2022 v2
Crediting Period	2023 — 2024
VVB	350Solutions
Verified ERs	1,706 tCO_2e
Monitoring Period	2025 — 2025
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Large contradiction in verified removals (1,706 vs 14,873) across documents, creating material uncertainty about issued/verified credit volume.
- ■ Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, despite being a key integrity element for material-based carbon removal accounting.
- ■ Corrective action required to fix the fossil CO2 subtraction in the CORC calculation file, indicating a quantification error in the removals calculation.
- ■ Safeguards reporting is inconsistent across documents and no grievance mechanism or FPIC is evidenced in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The verification report confirms additionality via an investment test and reports no material findings.

- Leakage is not addressed and the baseline is project-specific with no reassessment date found in the extracted record.

The verification report (2025-12-19) confirms additionality using an investment test and reports no material findings, which supports basic additionality credibility. However, leakage is explicitly noted as not addressed in the extracted record, and no leakage deduction is provided, weakening integrity for a material-based removal pathway. The baseline is described as project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not found in the extracted record, increasing baseline robustness uncertainty. Permanence risk appears managed only partially: no reversals are reported, but there is no buffer pool contribution (0%), so the project relies on other controls not evidenced here.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ A named VVB (350Solutions) and a defined monitoring period (2025-04-01 to 2025-06-30) are provided in the verification record.

- Key MRV figures are inconsistent across documents (verified removals conflict) and the claimed removals figure is not found in the extracted record.

The extracted record provides a named VVB (350Solutions) and a clear monitoring period (2025-04-01 to 2025-06-30), which supports traceability. Transparency is reduced because the total removals claimed are not found in the extracted record, and there is a major inconsistency in the verified removals across documents. The verification report (2025-12-19) also required corrective actions, indicating that the underlying quantification and disclosures needed improvement. Registry completeness is mixed: a registry code is provided (PUR-625222), but supporting public document identifiers are not available beyond “unknown.”

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by the contradiction in verified removals and the required correction to fossil CO2 subtraction in the removals calculation.

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims. Claim safety is nonetheless weakened by the contradiction in verified removals (1,706 vs 14,873) across documents, which creates a clear over-crediting/over-claiming risk until reconciled. The verification report (2025-12-19) required correction of the fossil CO2 subtraction in the CORC calculation file, directly indicating a risk that removals were miscalculated prior to correction. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ The extracted record references a verification report dated 2025-12-19 and indicates 17 documents were used.

- Evidence document titles are not identifiable in the extracted record and extraction confidence is only medium, with several key fields not found.

Documentation coverage is moderate: the extracted record indicates 17 documents were used and includes a verification report dated 2025-12-19, suggesting recent third-party review. However, the evidence document list is not identifiable (listed as “unknown”), limiting auditability for an external reviewer. Several key fields (e.g., claimed removals, leakage deduction, baseline reassessment timing, usage monitoring method) are not found in the extracted record, indicating gaps. Extraction confidence is medium, so some caution is warranted in relying on the completeness of extracted details.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	No reversals reported, but no buffer pool
● **Leakage**	Leakage not addressed
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessment not evidenced
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards inconsistently documented; no FPIC/grievance
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled, period-specific removals table that clearly explains the 1,706 vs 14,873 discrepancy and links each figure to a specific monitoring/crediting period and verification statement.

→ Provide a documented leakage assessment (and deduction if applicable) consistent with the methodology, including system boundaries and justification.

→ Disclose the corrected CORC calculation approach (including fossil CO_2 subtraction) and provide an auditable change log showing what was corrected and why.

Documents Reviewed

- OTechnologies_statement_v4.pdf
- Audit_2025_LeedsProductionFacility_report.pdf
- Report_M6.pdf
- Audit_2024_AmBrLd_report.pdf
- Report_MP5.pdf
- Audit_2025_LeedsProductionFacility_statement.pdf
- Puro_Registration_LeedsProductionFacility.pdf
- OTechnologies_statement_v1.pdf
- Withdrawal_2023_Leeds.pdf
- Audit_2024_AmBrLd_statement.pdf
- OTechnologies_statement.pdf
- OTechnologies_report.pdf
- OTechnologies.pdf
- OTechnologies_report_v4.pdf
- OTechnologies_Leeds.pdf
- OTechnologies_report_v1.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-45247D3D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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