

QUALITY REPORT

MSR-X: Verified Polymer Substitution Emission Reductions

CMARK-5 · CMARK · Netherlands

Report ID: CM-3C868145 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1

Overall Score

out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
■ Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality via a barrier test and reports no material findings or corrective actions in the verification report. However, key quantification elements are missing from the extracted record (no verified or claimed ER totals, no baseline reassessment date), and safeguards information is inconsistent across documents, increasing over-crediting and reputational risk.

Project Details

Registry	CMARK
Registry ID	CMARK-5
Sector	other
Country	Netherlands
Vintage	2025
Project Methodology	XTokenz Verified Recovery & Recycling (XVRR) 1.4
VVB	Control Union (UK) Limited
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2025
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No extracted values for claimed or verified emission reductions, limiting the ability to assess over-crediting risk
- Safeguards are contradictory between the PDD and validation report, undermining confidence in social/environmental risk management
- Leakage is described as quantified but a 0% leakage deduction is applied, which may indicate incomplete leakage treatment

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The verification report confirms additionality using a barrier test and reports no material findings or corrective actions.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

The verification report (2025-10-28) confirms additionality via a barrier test and reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports basic integrity. However, the baseline is described as project-specific and the date of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, weakening confidence that the baseline remains conservative over time. Leakage is stated as quantified, yet the monitoring/verification record applies a leakage deduction of 0%, which warrants caution unless the quantification clearly demonstrates immaterial leakage.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + A named VVB (Control Union (UK) Limited) and a defined monitoring period (2023-01-01 to 2025-09-30) are provided in the verification report.
- Total emission reductions claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

The verification report provides a clear monitoring period (2023-01-01 to 2025-09-30) and identifies the VVB as Control Union (UK) Limited. But the extracted record does not include total emission reductions claimed or verified, preventing an external reader from checking arithmetic, uncertainty, or whether issuance aligns with verified results. Several MRV-relevant fields (e.g., usage monitoring method) are also not found in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.
- Missing ER totals and a project-specific baseline with no reassessment date elevate over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-stakes aviation claims. Nonetheless, the absence of extracted claimed/verified ER totals and the lack of a stated baseline reassessment date increase the risk that credits could be perceived as overstated or not reproducible by third parties. CCP status is not stated in available documents, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity labels and associated marketing claims.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

- + Multiple document types are referenced (validation report, PDD, and a verification report dated 2025-10-28) with high extraction confidence.
- An internal contradiction on safeguards between the PDD and validation report indicates documentation reliability issues.

The evidence set includes a verification report dated 2025-10-28 plus a validation report and PDD, and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting a moderate documentation score. However, safeguards-related information is inconsistent across documents, and key quantitative outputs (claimed/verified ER totals) are not present in the extracted record, indicating incomplete extract coverage or incomplete reporting in the documents provided.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Buffer pool stated; reversals not evidenced
● Leakage	Quantified but 0% deduction
● Baseline	Project-specific; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards inconsistent across documents
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish and/or extract the total emission reductions claimed and verified for the monitoring period, including calculation spreadsheets and uncertainty/QA checks referenced in the verification report.
- Resolve safeguards inconsistencies by aligning the PDD and validation/verification narratives (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) and providing explicit safeguard procedures and evidence.

Documents Reviewed

- MSR-X — Public LCA Technical Summary V2
- Annex X — ISO 14040_44 Alignment of the MSR-X Verified Recovery & Recycling (XVRR) Methodology V6
- Project Design Document (PDD) V8.0 Public Redacted
- Verification Statement CUUK-XTOK-0001

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-3C868145 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy