QUALITY REPORT

Baoshan East Hope Swine Farm AWMS GHG Mitigation Project

VCS-5431 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-3400CFD5 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.6
	Transparency (25%)	4.1
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards, but key risk controls are weakly evidenced. Transparency is limited by missing monitoring and issuance data, and the record contains contradictions that reduce confidence in the extracted facts.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-5431
Sector	other
Country	China
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0010 08
Crediting Period	2023 — 2033
VVB	CTI Certification Co., Ltd.
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the validation report, despite the PDD reportedly treating it differently.
- The crediting period and additionality conclusions differ between the PDD and the validation report, creating reliability concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by CTI Certification Co., Ltd. in the validation report, which is stronger than the earlier PDD position.

- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the validation report, and no buffer pool or reversal treatment is stated.

The validation report confirms additionality through a common-practice test and states that CTI Certification Co., Ltd. verified it, which supports the project. However, leakage is not addressed in the validation report, buffer pool coverage is not found, and reversal treatment is not stated, which weakens permanence and leakage robustness.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB and a recent validation report dated 2026-01-18, with nine extracted documents used overall.

- Monitoring period, verified emission reductions, and usage monitoring details are not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency is constrained because the extracted record does not state the monitoring period, verified emission reductions, or usage monitoring method. The presence of a named VVB and a recent validation report helps, but the missing quantitative MRV details leave the public evidence base incomplete.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project is not described as CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved in the available record, so dual-claim risk is not elevated on the evidence provided.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized or recently reassessed, and leakage treatment is unclear.

Claim safety is only moderate because the project uses a project baseline and leakage is not addressed in the validation report. The record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval, so there is no direct evidence of dual-claim exposure, but the absence of clear eligibility information limits confidence.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ The record includes both a PDD and a validation report, plus safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, one document is listed as unknown, and there are contradictions on additionality, leakage, and the crediting period.

Documentation is mixed: there are multiple official documents, a recent validation report, and safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. Still, extraction confidence is only medium, one source is listed as unknown, and the record contains contradictions on additionality, leakage, and the crediting period, which lowers reliability.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed common-practice test
Permanence	No buffer or reversal treatment stated
Leakage	Leakage not addressed in final validation
Baseline	Project baseline without reassessment evidence
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the monitoring report and verified issuance figures, including the monitoring period and any usage monitoring method.

→ Resolve the contradictions between the PDD and validation report, especially on additionality, leakage treatment, and the crediting period.

Documents Reviewed

- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-3400CFD5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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