senken

Your holistic partner for
high quality carbon credits

Before You Buy:

10 Key Questions to Identify Low-Quality Carbon Sellers

Choosing the right carbon credits isn't easy — especially with so many claims out there. This guide offers 10 smart questions to help cut through the noise, focusing on what really matters: transparency, risk, long-term impact, and future-proofing. Use it to make more confident, informed decisions.

QUESTION 1

Do you publish the complete project design document, baseline calculations, monitoring reports, and verifier statements - along with raw satellite or drone data - for every credit you sell, without requiring paywalls?

Transparency & Data Access

Transparent access to primary project documentation is a baseline expectation for quality assurance. If these materials are withheld or hidden behind legal barriers, it suggests a lack of meaningful scrutiny. Full public access allows independent verification of additionality, methodologies, and permanence assumptions. Key for any buyer conducting serious due diligence.

QUESTION 2

What percentage of your listed credits already carry, or have applied for, the Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market's (ICVCM) Core Carbon Principles (CCP) label?

Alignment with Core Carbon Principles (CCP)

The CCP standard is quickly becoming the baseline for credit integrity. About one-third of legacy credits (mainly renewables and cookstoves) have already been disqualified. Providers without a majority of CCP-aligned or pending credits may be offering outdated or risky stock. Buyers should expect clear documentation to confirm eligibility.

QUESTION 3

What proportion of your portfolio achieves over 200 years of carbon storage, in line with the Oxford Principles for Net-Zero-Aligned Offsetting, and what evidence substantiates these claims?

Carbon Storage Durability

As net-zero commitments mature, buyers must shift toward long-duration removals. Temporary storage credits may not meet future compliance or regulatory standards. Claims of >200-year storage should be backed by geophysical analysis, third-party reviews, and lifecycle data. Platforms offering only short-lived or avoidance credits are increasingly misaligned with climate science and policy.

QUESTION 4

How frequently do you reassess reversal, leakage, and non-permanence risks using independent earth observation data, and how do those scores influence buffer pool deductions? Do you mandate a 3rd party dMRV provider for every project you offer?

Reversal and Non-Permanence Risk Monitoring

Risks such as fire, land-use change, or project abandonment evolve over time. Relying on static validations is inadequate. Providers should implement regular monitoring—ideally using satellite or drone data—to update risk profiles and dynamically adjust buffer pool contributions. A lack of ongoing reassessment is a red flag for permanence risk.

QUESTION 5

Have you ever listed or sold projects rated below BBB by agencies like BeZero or Sylvera? If so, which ones, and what was your rationale?

Portfolio Quality Control

Independent ratings offer a helpful benchmark for credit risk. Projects rated below BBB often carry moderate to high concerns around additionality, permanence, or measurement. Providers listing such projects should disclose and justify their inclusion—otherwise, quality controls may be in question. Not offering rated credits is another red flag.

QUESTION 6

What portion of your current portfolio would meet the thresholds of the EU Carbon Removal Certification Framework (CRCF) and remain eligible if removals are integrated into the EU ETS after 2027?

EU Market Readiness

The CRCF will define strict criteria for removals entering regulated markets. Providers need to show how their projects align with these standards, including monitoring rigor, storage duration, and additionality requirements. Credits that cannot meet CRCF criteria are likely to become stranded assets in the evolving European regulatory landscape.

QUESTION 7

How is your project selection team insulated from commercial pressures, such as sales targets or consulting upsells, to avoid favouring higher-margin, lower-integrity projects?

Governance and Conflict of Interest Mitigation

Bundling project assessment with commercial interests introduces bias. Quality-focused providers ensure a clear separation between technical evaluation teams and sales or advisory departments.

QUESTION 8

How many distinct projects do you currently make available?

Stock Quality

Independent ratings show less than one-quarter of assessed projects earn an AA or A rating, and none hit AAA, so a catalogue boasting hundreds of projects almost certainly includes low-quality stock.

QUESTION 9

Can you provide third-party documentation (not marketing claims) demonstrating additionality and baseline validity for each project - and if the baseline has been challenged, what was the outcome?

Additionality & Robust Baselines

Additionalilty and robust baselines are the backbone of real impact. Credits from projects with weak, disputed or “grandfathered” baselines are a major source of greenwashing - and quality platforms are transparent about how they handle or reject them.

QUESTION 10

If I buy credits today and a project later loses its certification, is reversed (E.g. due to fire), or is found to be over-credited, will you replace, refund, or compensate me? Is this policy public?

Seller’s Guarantees

Most sellers’ guarantees stop at the transaction. True quality providers offer buyer protection and stand by it publicly.

Struggling to find reliable carbon credits?

Collaborate with our expert team to build your high-quality portfolio — powered by Senken’s AI Quality Framework and backed by 600+ metrics.

Laura Empl
Partnerships & Impact Manager
laura@senken.io