

QUALITY REPORT

Douglas County Forest Products

PUR-992402 · Puro · United States

Report ID: CM-8D50A5DA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This Puro.earth biochar removal project has some structural integrity features (a stated 5% buffer and a third-party verification report with no material findings), but key quality determinants are missing from the extracted record. In particular, additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and durability/usage monitoring details are not stated in the available extracted documents, increasing over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Puro
Registry ID	PUR-992402
Sector	biomass
Country	United States
Vintage	2021, 2022
Project Methodology	Puro.earth Biochar Methodology v2.2
VVB	EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
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 extracted record.
- Baseline method and any reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record.
- Leakage deduction and justification are not stated in the extracted record.
- No extracted information on biochar use/monitoring (e.g., application tracking or durability-related controls), increasing uncertainty for removal claims.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- + The verification report (2022-02-25) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.
- Additionality, baseline approach, and leakage treatment are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the credited removals.

The project is presented as a biochar removal activity under the Puro.earth Biochar Methodology v2.2, but the extracted record does not state the additionality test used or whether additionality was confirmed by the VVB. The verification report (2022-02-25) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is a positive signal for conformance to stated requirements. However, baseline method, leakage deduction/justification, and any reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, which materially limits confidence in the robustness of credited removals. A 5% buffer is stated, but reversal events and their treatment are not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The VVB is identified (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) and the monitoring period is specified (2020-07-01 to 2021-12-31).
- Key MRV/registry fields (verified removals, claimed removals, leakage deduction, and monitoring approach for biochar use) are not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency is mixed: the verification report (2022-02-25) identifies the VVB (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) and the monitoring period is clearly specified (2020-07-01 to 2021-12-31). At the same time, the extracted record does not include claimed versus verified total removals, nor does it include the monitoring approach for biochar use or any leakage accounting, reducing the ability for third parties to reproduce or sanity-check results. The registry is listed as "other" and the evidence document references are non-specific ("unknown"), which further limits traceability.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

- + The project is under a named methodology (Puro.earth Biochar Methodology v2.2), which can reduce discretion if applied rigorously.
- CORSIA/CCP status and core quantification inputs (baseline and leakage) are not stated in the extracted record, elevating greenwashing and over-crediting risk.

Claims risk is elevated because key determinants of over-crediting are not stated in the extracted record: baseline method, leakage treatment, and any usage monitoring method for the biochar. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily position the credits against higher-integrity eligibility screens. While the project sits under a defined methodology (Puro.earth Biochar Methodology v2.2), the absence of extracted quantitative results (claimed/verified removals) and core assumptions increases greenwashing risk if strong claims are made.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

- + A dated verification report is present (2022-02-25) and extraction confidence is medium across 3 documents.
- The evidence document list is not specific (listed as "unknown"), and several critical fields are missing from the extracted record.

Documentation appears partially complete: there is a dated verification report (2022-02-25), no material findings, and no corrective actions required, and the minimum extraction confidence is medium across 3 documents. However, the extracted record lacks many critical fields (additionality, baseline, leakage, usage monitoring, safeguards/FPIC/grievance), and the evidence document list is not identifiable beyond "unknown". These gaps reduce confidence that the full set of supporting materials is available and reviewable.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced in extracted record
● Permanence	Buffer stated (5%) but reversal treatment not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage deduction/justification not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced
● Safeguards	FPIC/grievance/safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and extract the additionality demonstration (test type, key parameters) and explicit VVB confirmation from the verification report and/or PDD.

→ Provide the baseline approach and leakage accounting (deduction percentage and justification), plus the biochar use/monitoring method and any durability-related controls, along with claimed vs verified removals for the monitoring period.

Documents Reviewed

- Description_DouglasCountyForestProducts.pdf
- Audit_2022_DouglasCountyForestProducts.pdf
- Puro_Registration_DouglasCountyForestProducts.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-8D50A5DA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy