

QUALITY REPORT

Shuangbaotai Animal Manure Management System GHG Mitigation Project in Guangxi Province

GS-3357 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-E2747365 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.1
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	3.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality, FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and quantified leakage treatment. However, key documentation gaps, low extraction confidence, unresolved corrective actions, and contradictions in the crediting period and reversal treatment reduce confidence in the claimed climate benefits.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3357
Sector	biogas
Country	China
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC Version 3.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2024
VVB	CTI Certification Co., Ltd (CTI)
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- Six verification issues were raised, including three corrective action requests, and the extraction confidence is low.
- The documents conflict on the crediting period and on whether reversal events were addressed, which weakens reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under the Gold Standard TPDDTEC methodology.

- Reversal treatment is not clearly addressed, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and the record shows multiple verification findings with corrective actions required.

The project benefits from a VVB-confirmed additionality assessment and a combined additionality test, which supports the baseline and project rationale. Still, reversal handling is weakly documented: reversal events are marked as not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and the record includes several verification findings with corrective actions required. Leakage is at least acknowledged as quantified, but the absence of a stated deduction percentage limits confidence in the robustness of the crediting approach.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The monitoring period is stated, the VVB is named, and the project is linked to Gold Standard registry documentation.

- Total emissions reductions claimed versus verified are not stated, and several monitoring details such as usage monitoring and FNRB inputs are missing.

The monitoring period and VVB identity are available, and the project is tied to Gold Standard documentation, which helps traceability. However, total emissions reductions claimed and verified are not stated, and important MRV details such as usage monitoring and FNRB inputs are missing from the extracted record. The low extraction confidence further reduces transparency because at least one key document was poorly readable.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ Leakage is described as quantified, which is better than an unaddressed leakage assumption.

- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated and the record contains contradictions on core period data, increasing over-crediting and claim-risk concerns.

Claim safety is weakened by missing quantitative evidence on usage rates, FNRB, and verified emissions reductions, all of which are important for biogas electricity projects. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available record. Leakage being quantified is a positive, but the contradictory period information and unresolved reversal treatment increase the risk of over-crediting.

Documentation — 3.8 / 10

+ Multiple evidence documents were used, including a PDD and monitoring report, and safeguards are explicitly mentioned.

- Extraction confidence is low, the document set includes an unknown source, and several key fields are not stated in available documents.

The evidence base includes multiple official documents, including a PDD and monitoring report, and the project documents safeguards such as FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and benefit sharing. Even so, the extraction confidence is low, one document source is unknown, and several fields are not stated in available documents. The presence of three corrective action requests also suggests the documentation package was not fully clean at verification.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed test
● Permanence	reversal treatment unclear
● Leakage	quantified but not fully specified
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified emissions reduction totals, leakage deduction percentage, and usage monitoring methodology for the monitoring period.

→ Resolve the crediting-period and reversal-event contradictions in a reconciled verification note, and disclose buffer pool treatment and any outstanding corrective action closures.

Documents Reviewed

- Annual Report-Guangxi-GS11336-2024.docx
- 20230808_GS4GG Final VER Report_Shuangbaitai Guangxi Swine 2nd_clean(1).pdf
- T-PerfCert_v3.0-Project-Annual-Report-GS 11336-Shuangbaotai Guangxi.pdf
- MR-Shuangbaotai Guangxi-1st-20220913-V03-clean.docx
- ER-Shuangbaotai Guangxi-1st-20220624-V02.xlsx
- ER-Shuangbaotai Guangxi-2nd-V02.xlsx
- MR-Shuangbaotai Guangxi-2nd-V03-Clean(1).docx
- 20221014_GS4GG Final VER Report_Shuangbaitai Guangxi Swine 1st_clean.pdf
- SDG-Impact-Tool-1st-20220624-V01.xlsx
- SDG-Impact-Tool-20220624-V01.xlsx
- 20221014_GS4GG Final VAL Report_Shuangbaitai Guangxi Swine-clean.pdf
- SCR-Shuangbaotai Guangxi_20220624_V02-clean.docx
- 04 ER-Shuangbaotai AWMS GHG Mitigation Project in Guangxi Province-V02.xls
- 05 IRR-Shuangbaotai AWMS GHG Mitigation Project in Guangxi Province.xls
- 03 PDD-Shuangbaotai AWMS GHG Mitigation Project in Guangxi Province-V02.docx
- PDD-Shuangbaotai Guangxi_V05-clean.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3357
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3357

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-E2747365 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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