

QUALITY REPORT

OBIO Rudshøgda

PUR-727586 · Puro · Norway

Report ID: CM-D6422622 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.0

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	3.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
■ Documentation (15%)	2.6

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

Assessment Summary

This biochar removal project has some basic integrity signals (a stated investment additionality test and no material findings reported), but key quantifications needed to judge over-crediting risk are missing from the extracted record. Documentation reliability is weakened by low extraction confidence, a corrective action request, and contradictions across documents.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-727586
Sector	biochar
Country	Norway
Vintage	2023, 2024
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	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Additionality is stated as an investment test but is not confirmed by the VVB in the verification report.
- Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) is not found in the extracted record for a biochar project.
- Corrective Action Request on “biochar in stock” suggests MRV/control weaknesses relevant to storage/issuance timing.
- Contradictory statements on whether safeguards are mentioned, and conflicting crediting period dates across documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ The verification report reports no material findings.

- Leakage and permanence controls (buffer contribution and any reversal events) are not found in the extracted record.

The verification report (dated 2025-12-31) indicates an investment additionality test is used, but it does not confirm additionality by the VVB, which weakens additionality robustness. The baseline is described as project-specific, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not found in the extracted record, increasing baseline uncertainty. Permanence-related controls (buffer pool contribution) and any reversal events are not found in the extracted record, and leakage deduction/justification are also not found, limiting confidence in net removals.

Transparency — 3.6 / 10

+ A VVB is identified (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) and a monitoring period is specified (2024-04-01 to 2025-09-30).

- Key MRV outputs (claimed vs verified removals) and key parameters (e.g., usage monitoring) are not found in the extracted record.

The verification report identifies the VVB (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) and provides a monitoring period (2024-04-01 to 2025-09-30). However, the extracted record does not include claimed or verified total removals for the period, preventing an independent sense-check of issuance quantities. A corrective action request in the verification report ("Biochar in stock") suggests monitoring/controls required improvement, which reduces MRV transparency.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain double-claiming/eligibility marketing risks.

- Over-crediting risk cannot be well assessed because verified removals and leakage treatment are not found in the extracted record.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of CORSIA-related claims. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily infer alignment with CCP-style quality screens. Because leakage treatment and verified removals are not found in the extracted record, there is elevated uncertainty around over-crediting risk for public claims.

Documentation — 2.6 / 10

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable.

- A corrective action request is listed in the verification report, and the evidence document list is not specific (shown as "unknown").

Although 9 documents were used, the evidence document list is not specific (shown as "unknown"), and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating readability/parse issues that reduce reliability. The verification report (2025-12-31) includes a corrective action request, which signals documentation and control gaps that should have been addressed. Contradictions across documents (safeguards mention and crediting period dates) further weaken documentation confidence.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Investment test stated, not VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	Buffer/reversal info not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/clearly extract the claimed and verified net removals for the monitoring period, including leakage deductions and justification, and any uncertainty/QA results from the verification report.

→ Clarify and reconcile the crediting period and safeguards documentation across project documents/registry, and document permanence controls (e.g., buffer contribution, storage/stock controls) and closure of the corrective action request.

Documents Reviewed

- gda.pdf
- gda_report.pdf
- gda_statement.pdf
- Description_OplandskeBio.pdf
- Report_MP4.pdf
- Statement_MP4.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-D6422622 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy