

QUALITY REPORT

A Better Use for Pig Poo

CE-a-better-use-for-poo · VCS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-E914F8A3 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality via a barrier test, but core quantification elements (baseline inputs and leakage treatment) are weakly evidenced in the extracted record. Multiple corrective actions cite missing data and missing supporting spreadsheets/licenses, which raises over-crediting and auditability concerns. Safeguards and leakage statements are inconsistent across documents, increasing reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	CE-a-better-use-for-poo
Sector	industrial
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-III.F. 10
Crediting Period	2011 — 2020
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A.
Verified ERs	29,826 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2015 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Verification/monitoring issues: missing key parameter values and missing supporting evidence (licenses, daily farmer reports, calculation spreadsheets) cited as corrective actions in the monitoring report (2015).
- Leakage treatment is unclear: leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report (2015) but is described as negligible in the validation report (2020).
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.6 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test (validation report).
- Leakage is not treated consistently and key baseline/emission factor calculations are flagged as incorrect or missing (monitoring report corrective actions).

The validation report confirms additionality using a barrier test and indicates it was verified by the VVB, which supports additionality. However, the monitoring report (2015) lists corrective actions indicating missing parameter values and missing evidence (including licenses and calculation spreadsheets), and it flags incorrect emission factor values for 2015 with missing calculation support. Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record, weakening confidence in net ER integrity. The baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

- + Both claimed and verified ERs are available (28,564 claimed vs 29,826 verified).
- MRV transparency is weakened by missing underlying evidence and missing calculation spreadsheets noted by the verifier (monitoring report corrective actions).

The extracted record provides a clear monitoring period (2015-07-01 to 2019-04-30) and both claimed and verified ER totals (28,564 claimed and 29,826 verified). Transparency is reduced because the monitoring report's corrective actions explicitly note that key evidences and calculation spreadsheets were not provided to the verification team, limiting reproducibility. Key parameters such as the grid emission factor are not found in the extracted record, and the method for usage monitoring is not stated.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

- Over-crediting risk due to incorrect/missing emission factor calculations and absent supporting spreadsheets (monitoring report corrective actions).
- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, leaving buyer-claim constraints unclear.

Claim safety is constrained by audit findings that point to missing data and incorrect/missing emission factor calculations for 2015, which increases over-crediting risk (monitoring report corrective actions). Leakage treatment is unclear: the monitoring report states leakage is not addressed, while the validation report later characterizes leakage as negligible, creating uncertainty about whether leakage was appropriately assessed and documented. CCP status and CORSIA eligibility are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily determine whether additional claim restrictions apply.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are present (PDD, monitoring report, validation report) and extraction confidence is high.
- Documented corrective actions indicate incomplete evidence packages provided to the verification team (monitoring report).

Documentation coverage is moderate: the extracted record includes a PDD, monitoring report, and validation report, and the minimum extraction confidence is high. Nonetheless, the monitoring report's corrective actions show that the evidence package presented to the verifier was incomplete (missing licenses, daily reports, and spreadsheets), which is a documentation quality concern. No buffer pool percentage or reversal information is found in the extracted record, leaving permanence-related documentation incomplete.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not consistently addressed
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment unclear
● Safeguards	Mentioned inconsistently; no FPIC/grievance
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the missing evidence cited by the verifier (licenses, daily farmer logs, integrator spreadsheets, and ER calculation workbooks) and publish a transparent calculation package for the monitoring period.

→ Resolve leakage and safeguards inconsistencies by documenting a clear leakage assessment (with quantified deduction or robust justification) and publishing safeguards evidence (FPIC/grievance mechanism and monitoring).

Documents Reviewed

- Brazil Swine Compost Monitoring Report - 2013
- Brazil Swine Compost Project Description - 2014
- Brazil Swine Compost Verification Report 2013-2015
- Brazil Swine Compost Verification Report 2020

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-E914F8A3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy