

QUALITY REPORT

Termowood - Hurdal

PUR-641179 · Puro · Norway

Report ID: CM-60BA9FEE · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.1

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.8
■ Transparency (25%)	3.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.0
■ Documentation (15%)	3.6

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

Assessment Summary

Based on the extracted record, key integrity elements (additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and monitoring details) are not stated in the available documentation for this Puro Alternative Materials project. While the VVB is identified (DNV GL) and no material findings or corrective actions are reported, the lack of quantified MRV and methodological details materially increases over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-641179
Sector	biomass
Country	Norway
Vintage	2020
VVB	DNV GL
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Additionality approach and whether it was confirmed by the VVB are not stated in the available documents.
- Baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record.
- Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) is not stated, despite being important for biomass/wood product system boundaries.
- No monitoring period, claimed removals/reductions, or verified totals are provided in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.8 / 10

- Baseline, additionality, leakage, and reversal/buffer provisions are not stated in the available documents (document dated 2021-06-01).

+ The extracted record shows no material findings and no corrective actions in the available document (unknown document type, 2021-06-01).

The extracted record does not state the additionality test used, whether additionality was confirmed by the VVB, or the baseline method (unknown document type, 2021-06-01). Leakage is also not quantified and no justification is provided, and permanence tools such as a buffer pool percentage or any reversal reporting are not stated (unknown document type, 2021-06-01). Although the record indicates no material findings and no corrective actions, the absence of core methodological and accounting information drives a low integrity score (unknown document type, 2021-06-01).

Transparency — 3.2 / 10

+ A specific VVB is named (DNV GL) in the extracted record (document dated 2021-06-01).

- Monitoring period and verified vs claimed totals are not stated, limiting MRV transparency (unknown document type, 2021-06-01).

Transparency is limited because the monitoring period, usage monitoring method, and any claimed versus verified totals are not stated in the extracted record (unknown document type, 2021-06-01). A positive element is that the VVB is named as DNV GL, which supports traceability of assurance in principle, but the underlying MRV details are not available here (unknown document type, 2021-06-01). With only one document of unknown type, registry-level completeness cannot be corroborated from the extracted record (unknown document type, 2021-06-01).

Claim Safety — 3.0 / 10

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated, and core quantification (claimed/verified totals) is missing, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk (unknown document type, 2021-06-01).

~ No material findings are reported, but the absence of baseline/leakage details prevents confidence in credit quality (unknown document type, 2021-06-01).

Claims risk is elevated because the extracted record provides neither total claimed nor total verified climate benefit, and does not state the baseline or leakage approach that would bound over-crediting risk (unknown document type, 2021-06-01). CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not stated, so buyers cannot easily position the credits against common integrity benchmarks (unknown document type, 2021-06-01). The absence of reported material findings helps, but it is insufficient without quantified MRV and accounting disclosures (unknown document type, 2021-06-01).

Documentation — 3.6 / 10

- Only one source document of unknown type is referenced, with many key fields not stated (evidence list: one 'unknown' document; dated 2021-06-01).

+ Extraction confidence is medium and the VVB is identified (DNV GL), supporting minimal document reliability (unknown document type, 2021-06-01).

Documentation appears incomplete: only one evidence document is listed and its type is unknown, while many key fields (methodology, monitoring period, baseline, leakage, reversals) are not stated in the extracted record (unknown document type, 2021-06-01). The minimum extraction confidence is medium, which is better than a low-readability case, and the VVB is identified as DNV GL (unknown document type, 2021-06-01). Overall, the record is too sparse to support high confidence scoring.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced in extracted record
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer provisions not stated
● Leakage	Leakage deduction/justification not stated
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance/safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the Puro methodology name/version used, the baseline scenario description, and the additionality demonstration as confirmed in the validation/verification report.

→ Disclose the monitoring period, quantified claimed and verified totals, and the leakage treatment (deduction percentage and justification), plus any permanence/reversal management provisions (e.g., buffer or replacement rules).

Documents Reviewed

- Description_Termwood.pdf
- Puro_Registration_TermowoodHurdal.pdf
- Audit_2020_Termowood-Hurdal.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-60BA9FEE · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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