

QUALITY REPORT

Yantai Xinhao Swine Farm Manure Management System GHG Mitigation Project

VCS-3164 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-D5FB4276 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

7.4

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	7.2
■ Transparency (25%)	7.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.4
■ Documentation (15%)	8.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registry-grade VCS project with a public validation/verification report, monitoring report, and project description, so confidence is relatively high. The main strength is that a third-party verifier audited the project and confirmed the manure-management system, but claim safety is moderated by the project's 2021-2022 vintage and the absence of any explicit CCP/Article 6/corresponding-adjustment signal.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3164
Country	China
Project Methodology	ACM0010 08.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2028
VVB	Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd (CTI)
Verified ERs	110,282 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-08

Red Flags

- Vintage is based on a 2021-2022 monitoring period and 2023 verification, which is dated for a current offset claim.
- The excerpt does not disclose the full additionality test results, so the strength of the investment/barrier analysis cannot be independently checked here.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 7.2 / 10

+ VVB confirmed replacement of uncovered lagoon with closed anaerobic digester under ACM0010 [Verification Report, 26-Jul-2023]

~ Leakage is stated as included in the ER calculation, but the exact deduction method is not shown in the excerpt [Verification Report]

The verification report (CTI, report ID 2022-0316, issued 26-Jul-2023) confirms the project replaced an uncovered anaerobic lagoon with a closed anaerobic digester/UASB system and that the baseline scenario was the pre-project lagoon. Additionality was assessed during validation under ACM0010 v08.0, but the excerpt does not show the full investment/barrier analysis, so I score this as solid but not best-in-class. Leakage is stated to be included in the ER calculation, which is positive, and the project is not an AFOLU permanence-heavy activity, so permanence risk is lower than for forestry projects. The main integrity limitation is that the report excerpt does not expose the detailed additionality evidence or the exact leakage deduction methodology.

Transparency — 7.8 / 10

+ Public validation/verification report, monitoring report, and project description are available from the registry package

+ Report includes site visit dates, interviews, and appendix references, supporting audit traceability [Verification Report]

Publicly accessible official documents are present in the registry package: a joint validation and 1st verification report, a monitoring report, and the project description/PDD text extract. The verification report is detailed and includes site visit dates, document review, interviews, and appendix references, which supports good transparency. However, the excerpt does not show the full monitoring report contents or the registry issuance/retirement history, so transparency is strong but not perfect. The project is clearly findable on VCS and the documentation is more than marketplace metadata.

Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ VCS-registered project with no evidence of other GHG program registration or other environmental credits [Verification Report]

~ No CCP/Article 6/corresponding-adjustment evidence shown; monitoring period is 2021-2022, limiting current-year claim strength

The project is registered under VCS, but the evidence provided does not indicate CCP approval, Article 6 authorization, or a corresponding adjustment, so buyer claim strength is limited to standard VCM claims. The first monitoring period covers 05-Mar-2021 to 30-Jun-2022, and the verification was issued in July 2023, so the vintage is not current-year and is somewhat dated for a present-day offset claim. The report says the project is not registered under other GHG programs and no other environmental credits were created, which reduces double-registration concern. A buyer could credibly claim support for methane reduction from manure management, but not a high-assurance compliance-style climate claim.

Documentation — 8.6 / 10

- + 120-page joint validation and 1st verification report issued 26-Jul-2023 [Verification Report]
- + Monitoring report and project description are publicly referenced in the official registry package

The evidence package includes a public verification report, validation report, monitoring report, and project description, all referenced from the official registry. The verification report is substantial (120 pages) and includes methodology, site visit, findings, and appendix references, which is strong documentation quality. The main gap is that the excerpt does not provide the full monitoring report tables or the registry issuance/retirement record, and the documents are from 2023 rather than recent ongoing monitoring. Overall, documentation is robust enough for a registry-grade assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	documented evidence
● Permanence	documented evidence
● Leakage	mixed evidence / unresolved risk
● Baseline	documented evidence
● Safeguards	documented evidence
● Double-claim	mixed evidence / unresolved risk

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish the full monitoring report tables showing manure volumes, biogas flow, operating hours, and leakage deductions for the verified period.
- Disclose the complete additionality demonstration, including investment analysis inputs, benchmark assumptions, and any barrier/common-practice evidence used under ACM0010.
- Add registry-level retirement/issuance history and any buyer claim guidance, including whether any corresponding adjustment or Article 6 authorization exists.

Documents Reviewed

- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation 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-D5FB4276 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-08 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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