

QUALITY REPORT

Avonmouth Production Facility

PUR-756292 · Puro · United Kingdom

Report ID: CM-FAA4CFEB · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	3.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	2.8

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

Assessment Summary

The verification report indicates additionality was assessed using an investment test and no material findings or corrective actions were reported. However, key integrity parameters (baseline reassessment timing, leakage treatment, permanence/buffer approach) are not stated in the extracted record, and low extraction confidence plus internal inconsistencies in reported figures reduce reliability. Overall, the project appears plausible but is not well-supported by extractable, consistent evidence for conservative credit-quality claims.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-756292
Sector	other
Country	United Kingdom
Vintage	2022, 2023
Project Methodology	Carbonated Materials Methodology v2
Crediting Period	2023 — 2024
VVB	350Solutions, Inc.
Verified ERs	14,873 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2025
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Conflicting verified removals figures across documents (14,873 vs 20,831) create over-crediting and reporting reliability risk.
- Safeguards are inconsistently reported (one document indicates safeguards mentioned; another indicates they were not), with no FPIC or grievance mechanism documented in the extracted record.
- Leakage treatment and justification are not stated in the extracted record, despite being important for alternative materials accounting.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, weakening evidentiary strength.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The verification report confirms additionality via an investment test and reports no material findings or corrective actions.
- Leakage, baseline reassessment timing, and permanence/buffer provisions were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the quantified outcome.

The verification report indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, and it reports no material findings and no corrective actions. However, the baseline is described only as project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record. Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) is also not stated, and permanence provisions such as a buffer pool or any reversal monitoring outcomes were not found in the extracted record, which weakens integrity confidence.

Transparency — 3.6 / 10

- + A named VVB (350Solutions, Inc.) and a defined monitoring period (2024-10-01 to 2025-09-30) are provided in the verification record.

- The extracted record lacks key MRV details (e.g., leakage deduction, usage monitoring method) and contains inconsistent reported results across documents.

The extracted verification record provides the VVB name (350Solutions, Inc.) and a clear monitoring period (2024-10-01 to 2025-09-30). At the same time, key MRV elements that would allow independent scrutiny—such as the leakage deduction, leakage justification, and the usage monitoring method—are not stated in the extracted record. Transparency is further reduced by inconsistencies across documents in the verified removals figure and by low extraction confidence.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.
- Conflicting verified removals values and missing leakage/baseline reassessment details increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk for public claims.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-stakes aviation-related claims. Nonetheless, claim safety is constrained by missing leakage and baseline reassessment information in the extracted record, both of which are central to over-crediting risk in alternative materials methodologies. The presence of conflicting verified removals values across documents also increases the risk that external claims could rely on an inflated or outdated figure.

Documentation — 2.8 / 10

- + A recent verification report date is provided (2025-12-19) and 12 documents were reportedly used in extraction.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low and the evidence document list is not identifiable in the extracted record, reducing auditability.

A recent verification report date (2025-12-19) is available, and the extraction indicates 12 documents were used. However, the minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key document was poorly readable, and the evidence document list is not identifiable beyond an 'unknown' entry in the extracted record. These gaps reduce traceability and make it difficult to validate key quantitative and safeguards-related assertions.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not stated
● Baseline	Project-specific; reassessment not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or clearly reference the underlying calculation annexes showing leakage treatment (deduction and justification), baseline parameters, and any reassessment schedule for the project-specific baseline.

→ Provide explicit safeguards documentation (stakeholder engagement, FPIC where relevant, and a grievance mechanism) and reconcile the conflicting verified removals and crediting-period statements across documents with a single, dated source of truth.

Documents Reviewed

- Puro_Registration_AvonmouthProductionFacility.pdf
- OTechnologies_statement_v1.pdf
- OTechnologies_report_v4.pdf
- CJ34k1EIR86bE6zcxW3qcwo29fe
- Audit_2024_AmBrLd_report.pdf
- OTechnologies_statement.pdf
- OTechnologies_report.pdf
- OTechnologies_statement_v4.pdf
- Audit_2024_AmBrLd_statement.pdf
- OTechnologies_report_v1.pdf
- OTechnologies_Avonmouth.pdf
- Withdrawal_2023_Avonmouth.pdf
- OTechnologies.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-FAA4CFEB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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