

QUALITY REPORT

BAITANG AONONG SWINE FARM COMPOSTING PROJECT

VCS-4168 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-17944429 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality via an investment test and reports no material findings in the validation record, which supports basic integrity. However, key quantifications needed to judge over-crediting risk (monitoring period, verified ERs, leakage treatment, and baseline reassessment timing) were not found in the extracted record, and the validation report notes corrective actions related to a technology change and updated calculations.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-4168
Sector	industrial
Country	China
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS-III.D. 21.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2031
VVB	CTI Certification Co., Ltd.
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record (no justification and no stated deduction), increasing over-crediting risk.
- No verified emission reductions, monitoring period, or claimed ER totals were found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess MRV quality and crediting accuracy.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation report (2023-07-17) confirms additionality using an investment test.

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment was not found in the extracted record; leakage is also not addressed.

The validation report (2023-07-17) confirms additionality via an investment test, which is a stronger additionality basis than a purely qualitative barrier claim. The baseline is described as project-specific, and the timing of any baseline reassessment was not found in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline robustness over the 2021–2031 crediting period. Leakage is explicitly not addressed in the extracted record (no justification and no deduction stated), which is a material integrity gap for a manure management/composting activity. No reversal buffer information was found in the extracted record; while reversal risk is typically lower than for sequestration projects, the absence of stated risk treatment still reduces robustness.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ A named VVB is provided (CTI Certification Co., Ltd.) and multiple document types are referenced (validation report and stakeholder consultation).

- Monitoring period and verified/claimed ER totals were not found in the extracted record, preventing cross-checks of MRV results.

The extracted record identifies the VVB (CTI Certification Co., Ltd.) and includes a stakeholder consultation document alongside the validation report, supporting basic transparency. However, the monitoring period and both claimed and verified emission reductions were not found in the extracted record, so the quality of MRV and the ability to reconcile calculations cannot be assessed. The record also does not provide usage monitoring details, which limits understanding of how activity data are tracked under the applied methodology.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, and there is no stated leakage deduction, elevating over-crediting/claim risk.

~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so downstream claim constraints cannot be confirmed.

Over-crediting risk is elevated because leakage is not addressed in the extracted record and there is no stated leakage deduction, leaving uncertainty about whether any displaced emissions or indirect effects were considered. The extracted record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so buyers cannot rely on those labels to reduce greenwashing risk. The validation report notes corrective actions tied to a technology change and updated calculation spreadsheets, which can be normal but increases the need for careful scrutiny of final credited quantities.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ The extracted record includes a recent validation report (2023-07-17) and indicates stakeholder consultation plus safeguards elements (FPIC and grievance mechanism).

- The validation report lists corrective actions related to a technology change and updated spreadsheets, and some key fields remain missing in the extracted record.

Documentation is moderately strong because the extracted record includes a recent validation report (2023-07-17), references stakeholder consultation, and indicates safeguards elements such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. At the same time, the validation report lists corrective actions required (technology change and modified project description/ER spreadsheet), suggesting earlier inconsistencies that needed resolution. Several key quantitative fields (monitoring period, ER totals, leakage deduction) were not found in the extracted record, indicating remaining evidence gaps. The minimum extraction confidence is medium, which is acceptable but not as strong as a fully high-confidence extraction.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal/buffer details found
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not found

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/confirm the monitoring period(s) and provide a clear reconciliation of claimed vs verified emission reductions in the monitoring/verification documentation.

→ Provide an explicit leakage assessment with justification and, if applicable, a quantified leakage deduction consistent with the methodology and project context.

Documents Reviewed

- Registration Review Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation

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-17944429 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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