

QUALITY REPORT

Black Earth Organic Waste Compost

CMARK-1 · CMARK · United States of America

Report ID: CM-3A154719 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.1

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	2.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	2.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project appears to follow a recognized composting protocol and additionality is stated as confirmed in the validation record, but key quantification data (monitoring period and verified ERs) is missing from the extracted documents. Safeguards-related statements are inconsistent between the PDD and the validation report, and low document readability further reduces confidence in the record.

Project Details

Registry	CMARK
Registry ID	CMARK-1
Sector	industrial
Country	United States of America
Vintage	2022, 2023
Project Methodology	Climate Action Reserve – Organic Waste Composting Project Protocol 1.1
Crediting Period	2022 — 2032
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No claimed or verified emission reductions were found in the extracted record, and the monitoring period is not stated.
- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is reported, despite composting projects often requiring clear leakage treatment.
- Safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are contradicted between the PDD and the validation report.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, increasing data reliability risk.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The validation report indicates additionality was confirmed using a combined test.
- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record and no leakage deduction is provided.

The validation report (2025-03-24) indicates additionality was confirmed using a combined test, which supports additionality robustness. The baseline is project-specific, and while the extracted record notes the baseline was last reassessed in 2021, the monitoring period and ER quantification needed to judge baseline performance were not found. Leakage is explicitly noted as not addressed in the extracted record, and no leakage deduction is provided, which weakens integrity for an avoidance composting activity. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the validation record, but the low extraction confidence reduces assurance that all issues were captured.

Transparency — 2.8 / 10

- + The project is linked to a specific protocol (Climate Action Reserve Organic Waste Composting Project Protocol v1.1).
- Monitoring period and ER totals (claimed and verified) were not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is limited because the monitoring period is not stated in the extracted record and neither claimed nor verified ER totals are available. The methodology is clearly identified as the Climate Action Reserve Organic Waste Composting Project Protocol v1.1, which helps trace MRV expectations, but the absence of the VVB name in the extracted record reduces audit traceability. The registry is identified as CAR, but key registry-style completeness indicators (e.g., verified ER totals) are missing from the extracted data.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.
- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline quantification and verified ER totals were not found, and leakage treatment is missing.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims. However, the extracted record does not include verified ER totals, the monitoring period, or leakage treatment, making it difficult to rule out over-crediting. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot rely on CCP screening as a backstop. Overall, claim safety is constrained by missing quantification and leakage information rather than by an explicit negative finding.

Documentation — 2.6 / 10

- + A validation report and PDD are listed as evidence documents.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low and the VVB name is not found in the extracted record.

The evidence set includes a validation report, a PDD, and an additional document of unknown type, but key fields (VVB name, monitoring period, ER totals) were not found in the extracted record. Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable, which materially reduces confidence in completeness. While the validation report date (2025-03-24) is recent, the record still lacks core monitoring/issuance figures needed for a complete assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality confirmed in validation
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed / deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; limited performance data
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance inconsistent across docs
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or extract the monitoring period and the claimed vs verified ER totals from the monitoring/verification documentation and registry record.

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment and, if applicable, a quantified leakage deduction consistent with the protocol, plus reconcile safeguards/FPIC/grievance statements between the PDD and validation report.

Documents Reviewed

- 2023 Framingham Compost Permit
- 2023 Groton Compost Permit
- 2023 Manchester Compost Permit
- Black Earth PDD OWC 2022-23
- Black Earth 2022 2023 Organic Waste Composting Technical Report

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-3A154719 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy