

QUALITY REPORT

Avoidance of Methane Emissions at Organic Compost Soil Amendment Facility

GS-500 · GS · United States

Report ID: CM-2033F06D · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, leakage was quantified at 0%, and safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism are documented. However, the record also shows material verification issues around waste accounting and missing details on sourcing and calculations, which reduce confidence in the claimed emission reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-500
Sector	industrial
Country	United States
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0010 7.0
Crediting Period	2015 — 2015
VVB	Perry Johnson Registrars Carbon Emissions Services, Inc
Monitoring Period	2015 — 2015
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The verification report lists material findings about green waste accounting and unclear calculation inputs, suggesting possible over-crediting risk.
- The project is marked as CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not mentioned, leaving some dual-claim uncertainty.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which is stronger than an unverified claim.
- The verification report recorded material findings on green waste handling and calculation methods, and reversal risk is not addressed.

The project's integrity is supported by VVB-confirmed additionality through an investment test and a quantified leakage deduction of 0% in the verification report. That said, the verification report also records material findings about green waste being included in calculations even though not all received waste was used, and the reversal risk is not addressed because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool is stated.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + The monitoring period, verifier name, and methodology version are stated in the available documents.
- Claimed versus verified ER totals are not provided, and key operational details such as usage monitoring and FNRB inputs are not stated.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring period, verifier name, methodology version, and registry are identified in the available documents. However, the record does not provide claimed or verified ER totals, and several operational fields such as usage monitoring and FNRB inputs are not stated, which limits auditability.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + Leakage was quantified with a 0% deduction, which reduces the risk of hidden emissions shifting.
- The project uses a project-specific baseline and the verification findings raise concerns about the accuracy of the waste input calculations.

Claim safety is weakened by the verification findings that question the accuracy of waste accounting and the source/location information for purchased green waste. The project does benefit from a quantified leakage treatment and a project method baseline, but the absence of verified usage-rate details and the calculation concerns increase over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were available, including the PDD, monitoring report, and verification report, and extraction confidence is high.
- The crediting period and monitoring period do not align cleanly, and some important fields remain unstated in the extracted record.

Documentation quality is fair because multiple official documents were used and extraction confidence is high. Still, some key items are missing from the extracted record, including buffer pool information, verified totals, and several monitoring inputs, so the evidence set is incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No buffer pool stated
● Leakage	Quantified 0% deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not mentioned

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled emissions table showing claimed versus verified reductions and the exact calculation inputs used for waste quantities.

→ Document reversal management and permanence protections, including whether a buffer pool applies and how any future reversals would be handled.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_04-01-2015 to 31-12-2015_v03.0.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_04-01-2015 to 31-12-2015_v03.0.pdf
- GS Passport_08-04-2013.pdf
- GS Passport_09-09-2016.pdf
- PDD_02-04-2014.pdf
- PDD_09-09-2016.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-500
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-500
- (1)Verification Report_monitoring period_04-01-2015 to 31-12-2015.pdf
- Verification Report_monitoring period_04-01-2015 to 31-12-2015.pdf

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-2033F06D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy