

## QUALITY REPORT

# Biogas Digesters for Farmers

CE-biogas-digesters-for · CDM · Vietnam

Report ID: CM-814B5E47 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 1.5

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

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

## Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project details beyond the project name, standard, country, and sector, and the underlying documents were not successfully captured. With no evidence on additionality, baseline, leakage, monitoring, or verification, the carbon-credit quality and claim reliability cannot be substantiated from the available materials.

## Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	CE-biogas-digesters-for
Sector	biogas
Country	Vietnam
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or incorrect facts.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record.

~ Biogas digester projects can be credible under CDM, but no project-specific evidence was available to assess over-crediting risks.

No validation/verification or monitoring documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal considerations are not stated in available documents. There is also no information on material findings or corrective actions from a VVB. Given these evidence gaps, integrity must be scored very conservatively.

### Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed emission reductions were found in the extracted record.

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

The extracted record does not include a VVB name, monitoring period, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions, so MRV transparency cannot be evaluated. No documentation was captured to confirm what was publicly disclosed or how complete the registry record is. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence in transparency.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- No information was found on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, baseline parameters, or leakage justification, so marketing claims would be high-risk.

~ Sector is prone to usage-rate and baseline fuel assumptions, but these were not documented in the extracted record.

No information was found on baseline assumptions, leakage justification, or any parameters that commonly drive over-crediting risk in household biogas programs (such as usage monitoring and default factors). CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not stated in available documents, so the risk of unsupported or overstated claims is high. As a result, claim safety is scored low.

### Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided and zero documents were used in extraction.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/processing issues and weak auditability.

The extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty document list, meaning the assessment cannot be grounded in official sources. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and may have led to missing facts. This warrants a very low documentation score (note: documentation <3 would cap transparency under the gate rules applied after scoring).

## Risk Indicators

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

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, validation report, monitoring report(s), and verification/certification report(s) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be assessed.

→ Improve document readability/extraction quality (higher-resolution scans/OCR) and include registry issuance/retirement records plus any CORSIA/CCP status statements.

### 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-814B5E47 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)