

QUALITY REPORT

BASNA d.o.o.

PUR-957051 · Puro · Serbia

Report ID: CM-BFB08DB8 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.1Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	3.2
■ Transparency (25%)	3.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.4
■ Documentation (15%)	2.6

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

Assessment Summary

This Puro biochar removal project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period, but key integrity-critical elements (additionality approach, baseline, leakage, permanence/buffer) were not found in the extracted record. With low extraction confidence and limited identifiable source documents, the risk of over-crediting or weak substantiation cannot be ruled out from the available evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-957051
Sector	biomass
Country	Serbia
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	Biochar Methodology 2.0
VVB	bio.inspecta AG
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Additionality approach and whether it was confirmed by the VVB were not found in the extracted record.
- Baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record.
- Leakage treatment (deduction and justification) was not found in the extracted record.
- Permanence provisions (buffer pool and any reversal reporting) were not found in the extracted record.
- Low extraction confidence and evidence documents listed as “unknown” reduce confidence in the completeness of the record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

- Additionality, baseline, leakage, and permanence provisions were not found in the extracted record (verification report dated 2022-01-25).

~ No material findings or corrective actions were reported, but this is hard to rely on given the limited/low-confidence extraction (verification report dated 2022-01-25).

The project is assessed under Puro's Biochar Methodology v2.0, but the extracted record does not include the additionality test type, whether additionality was confirmed by the VVB, the baseline method, or any baseline reassessment timing (verification report dated 2022-01-25). Leakage treatment is also missing: neither a leakage deduction nor a justification was found in the extracted record. Permanence-related provisions are unclear because buffer pool contribution and any reversal events were not found in the extracted record, which is material for a removal credit type.

Transparency — 3.0 / 10

+ The VVB is identified as bio.inspecta AG and the monitoring period is specified as 2020-01-01 to 2021-08-31 (verification report dated 2022-01-25).

- Total removals claimed and verified were not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency (verification report dated 2022-01-25).

The verification report identifies the VVB as bio.inspecta AG and specifies a monitoring period of 2020-01-01 to 2021-08-31 (verification report dated 2022-01-25). However, the extracted record does not provide total removals claimed or verified, preventing a basic cross-check of issuance quantities against monitoring results. Several MRV-relevant fields (e.g., usage monitoring method and fossil/non-fossil fraction approach) were not found in the extracted record, limiting transparency.

Claim Safety — 3.4 / 10

- No extracted information on baseline setting, leakage, or usage monitoring, increasing over-crediting/greenwashing risk for biochar removals (verification report dated 2022-01-25).

~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, leaving market-claim and double-claim risk unclear.

Because baseline method, leakage treatment, and usage monitoring approach were not found in the extracted record, there is elevated risk that credited removals could be overstated relative to what a third party could independently validate from the available data. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on this dataset alone to support higher-integrity claims or to assess potential double-claim exposure. The absence of quantified claimed/verified removals in the extracted record further increases greenwashing risk, as claims cannot be reconciled to verified outcomes.

Documentation — 2.6 / 10

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

- Evidence documents are not clearly identified (listed as "unknown") despite three documents being used, reducing auditability.

Although three documents were used, the evidence document list is not identifiable (shown as "unknown"), which weakens traceability to specific sources. Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable; this materially reduces confidence that key integrity elements were captured. The verification report is dated 2022-01-25, but the extracted record lacks core quantified outcomes (claimed/verified removals) and key methodological parameters.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced in extracted record
● Permanence	Buffer/reversal provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the specific additionality assessment used (and the VVB's conclusion) and the baseline approach from the PDD/verification report, with clear citations and dates.

→ Disclose quantified monitoring outcomes (total removals claimed and verified), leakage deduction and justification, and permanence provisions (buffer pool and reversal monitoring) in publicly accessible documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- Output_audit-statement_OAS-0008.pdf
- Puro_Registration_BASNA000.pdf
- Withdrawal_2021.pdf
- Facility_audit-statement_FAS-0008.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-BFB08DB8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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