QUALITY REPORT

Aluminum Recycling – A Solution for CO■ Emissions Reduction, Romania

GS-2835 · Gold Standard · Romania

Report ID: CM-F59A669C · Generated: 2026-04-11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4
Overall Score
out of 10

Integrity (35%)	**7.1**
Transparency (25%)	**6.0**
Claim Safety (25%)	**6.4**
Documentation (15%)	**5.4**

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some solid integrity signals: the VVB confirmed additionality, no reversal events were reported, and the monitoring report shows a quantified leakage treatment. However, the record has reliability issues, including a low extraction confidence and a contradiction on the crediting period, which weakens confidence in the documentation and claim safety. Overall, this looks like a moderately credible avoidance project, but not one with especially strong evidence quality.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-2835
Sector	industrial
Country	Romania
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS.III.AJ 9.0
Crediting Period	2022 — 2027
VVB	EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	111,868 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2025
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-11

Red Flags

- The monitoring report and PDD disagree on the crediting period, which raises document consistency concerns.
- Extraction confidence is low, so at least one key source was poorly readable and important details may be missing.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 7.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a barrier test under AMS.III.AJ.

- The baseline is project-specific and the last reassessment date is not stated in the available documents.

The monitoring report confirms additionality through a barrier test and states that no reversal events were reported, which supports the project’s core environmental integrity. Leakage is treated with a quantified deduction of 0%, and the project is an avoidance activity, so permanence risk is inherently lower than for removal projects. The baseline is project-specific, but the last reassessment date is not stated in the available documents, which limits confidence in baseline robustness.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ The monitoring report provides a verified issuance figure and names the VVB, EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited.

- Several key MRV details are not stated, including the usage monitoring method and any public registry completeness beyond the extracted record.

The monitoring report identifies the VVB as EPIC Sustainability Services Private Limited and provides a verified issuance total, which helps with traceability. At the same time, several MRV details are not stated in the available documents, including the usage monitoring method and any clear registry completeness information beyond the extracted record. The extraction confidence is low, so transparency is further weakened by the possibility that some source details were not captured accurately.

Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ Leakage is treated with a quantified deduction of 0%, which is better than leaving it unaddressed.

- The crediting period contradiction between the monitoring report and the PDD creates uncertainty about the project timeline and claim boundaries.

Claim safety is helped by the quantified leakage deduction and by the fact that the project is an avoidance project rather than a removal project with permanence exposure. However, the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted facts alone. The contradiction on the crediting period also creates uncertainty about the exact claim window, which lowers confidence in the emissions claim.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Multiple evidence documents were used, including a validation report, monitoring report, PDD, and stakeholder consultation material.

- Extraction confidence is low, and the record contains a direct contradiction on the crediting period, reducing trust in the documentation set.

The evidence set is reasonably broad, with a validation report, monitoring report, PDD, and stakeholder consultation material all listed among the sources used. Even so, the extraction confidence is low, indicating that at least one key document was difficult to read and may have led to missing or imperfect extraction. The contradiction between the monitoring report and the PDD on the crediting period is a material documentation weakness, and it is more credible to privilege the newer monitoring report because it is more recent and operationally specific.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
Leakage	Quantified 0% leakage deduction
Baseline	Project baseline; reassessment timing missing
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation note for the crediting period and any other document-level discrepancies.

→ Provide complete MRV details, including the usage monitoring method, baseline reassessment timing, and explicit registry/claim status.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring-Report_AS METAL_MP1_01.05.2022-13.02.2024_v2.2_04.11.2024_Clean.pdf
- Monitoring parameter no.6_SDG13_ ER Calculation_AS Metal_monitoring period 14.02.2024-31.12.2025_11.02.2026.xlsx
- Annual Report ANRE 2020 pg 126.pdf
- 2023 AS Metal Aluminum Recycling CO2 Saving Project_Annual Report_19.12.2024.pdf
- SDG13_ ER Calculation_AS Metal_monitoring period 01.05.2022-13.02.2024_04.11.2024.xlsx
- SDG-Impact-tool_AS METAL_monitoring period 14.02.2024-31.12.2025_11.02.2026.xlsx
- Monitoring-Report_AS METAL_MP1.1_14.02.2024-31.12.2025_11.02.2026 .pdf
- 2024 AS Metal Aluminium Recycling CO2 Saving Project_Annual Report_22.12.2025.pdf
- LSC Report_Stakeholder Consultation Report_AS Metal_07.01.2023.pdf
- PDD_AS Metal_v4_11.10.2023_clean.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-2835
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-2835
- FVR_GS_FVER_REP_AS METAL_2025BGCE1303_Rev 1.1Aa_04032026.pdf
- 25 June 2023_AS Metals_T-VVB_V.1.0-Audit-Techniques.xlsx
- FVR_GS_VER_REP_AS METAL_24BGCE227_Rev 3.1Aa_28112024.pdf
- Validation report_16.12.2023_AS Metal_clean.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-F59A669C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-11 · Generated: 2026-04-11

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