QUALITY REPORT

Trash to Treasure

CE-trash-to-treasure · CDM · Madagascar

Report ID: CM-29CF927E · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.7 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	3.2
Transparency (25%)	4.1
Claim Safety (25%)	3.0
Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This CDM landfill-gas avoidance project has limited extractable evidence on core integrity elements such as the baseline approach, additionality confirmation, and leakage treatment. While a monitoring report exists for 2017 with a stated emissions reduction claim, the lack of verified ER figures and missing VVB/verification details increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CE-trash-to-treasure
Sector	other
Country	Madagascar
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0001 11
Crediting Period	2012 — 2019
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, despite being central to landfill-gas quantification under ACM0001.
- ■ Additionality test type and whether a VVB confirmed additionality are not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Leakage is marked as not addressed and no leakage deduction is provided.
- ■ Verified emissions reductions are not found in the extracted record (only a claimed total is available).
- ■ Safeguards disclosure is inconsistent between the monitoring report and the PDD.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

+ No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the monitoring report (2018).

- Baseline, additionality, and leakage treatment are not evidenced in the extracted record (baseline method not found; leakage not addressed).

The monitoring report (2018) covers a 2017 monitoring period and reports no material findings or corrective actions, which is a positive signal for internal consistency. However, the baseline method is not found in the extracted record, and the baseline reassessment timing is also not stated, weakening confidence in baseline validity. Additionality is also not evidenced in the extracted record (no test type and no confirmation by a VVB). Leakage is flagged as not addressed and no leakage deduction is provided, which is a material integrity gap for an avoidance project.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated as 2017-01-01 to 2017-12-31 in the monitoring report (2018).

- VVB name and verified ER total are not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV traceability.

The monitoring report (2018) provides a clear monitoring period (2017) and a claimed emissions reduction total of 52,614 tCO_2e. However, the verified emissions reductions total is not found in the extracted record, and the VVB name is also not stated, reducing auditability and registry-grade traceability. With only two documents available (PDD and monitoring report), the public record appears incomplete for a full MRV chain (monitoring → verification → issuance).

Claim Safety — 3.0 / 10

- Only a claimed ER total of 52,614 tCO_2e is available (monitoring report, 2018), with no verified ER total found in the extracted record.

~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, leaving buyer-claim risk unclear.

Over-crediting risk is elevated because the extracted record lacks the baseline method and any verified ER figure; only the monitoring report (2018) claim is available. Leakage is not addressed and no deduction is stated, which increases the risk that credited reductions are overstated. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily substantiate higher-integrity claims or assess double-claim exposure through those channels.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

+ Two core document types are available (PDD and monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.

- Key verification/issuance artifacts (e.g., verification report with VVB details and verified ERs) are not present in the extracted record.

Documentation coverage is partial: the extracted record includes a PDD and a monitoring report, and extraction confidence is high. However, key third-party assurance elements are missing from the extracted record, including the verification report (and thus the VVB identity) and the verified ER total. The monitoring report date (2018-10-29) is reasonably aligned with the 2017 monitoring period, but the crediting period spans 2012–2019, and the extracted record does not show a complete sequence of monitoring/verification across that period.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Additionality not evidenced in extracted record
Permanence	Avoidance type, but reversal/buffer details not stated
Leakage	Leakage not addressed and no deduction stated
Baseline	Baseline method not found in extracted record
Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistently documented; no FPIC/grievance
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the verification report (including VVB identity) and the verified emissions reduction total for the 2017 monitoring period.

→ Disclose the baseline approach used under ACM0001 (including key parameters and any reassessment) and explicitly address leakage with a quantified deduction or a justified negligible assessment.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document

Report ID: CM-29CF927E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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