

QUALITY REPORT

Scaling Up Plastic Recycling in Eastern Europe

XEP-e866f8 · Gold Standard

Report ID: CM-0302DFF5 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.1 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality determinants (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring performance) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the project currently presents a high risk of over-crediting and weak auditability based on the available evidence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	XEP-e866f8
Sector	other
Vintage	2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability of any conclusions.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions were not found in the extracted record.

~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying documents.

No project design, monitoring, or verification documentation was captured in the extracted record (no evidence documents listed), so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. With these core elements missing, integrity cannot be substantiated and is scored very low. The low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that key integrity-relevant details were not reliably captured.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified results were found in the extracted record, limiting auditability.

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

Transparency is weak because the extracted record contains no monitoring period, no VVB identity, and no reported/verified emission reduction figures, making independent scrutiny impossible. With zero documents available, registry completeness and MRV quality cannot be evaluated from primary sources. Given the documentation score is below 3.0, a post-processing gate rule may cap transparency.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and leakage assumptions were not found in the extracted record.

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty around downstream claim risk.

Claim safety is low because the extracted record does not provide baseline methodology, leakage justification, or any quantified deductions that would allow assessment of over-crediting risk. Eligibility indicators (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about potential downstream claim and double-claim risks. In the absence of evidence, a conservative score is applied.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, leaving the assessment unsupported by primary sources.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues that undermine completeness.

Documentation quality is very poor: the extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence list, so there is no traceable basis for any claims. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable, which further reduces confidence in completeness. This materially limits the ability to validate any aspect of the project.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports so additionality, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and MRV procedures can be assessed.

→ Provide registry and assurance details (VVB name, monitoring period, issued vs verified results, and CORSIA/CCP status) to reduce claim and double-claim risk.

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-0302DFF5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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