

QUALITY REPORT

A-Gas V8 in Texas

ACR-773 · ACR Standard · United States

Report ID: CM-DC9F8E72 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This is an HFC refrigerant reclamation avoidance project under ACR with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no reversals reported. However, leakage treatment and safeguards are inconsistently documented between the PDD and later monitoring/verification materials, creating some over-crediting and reputational risk.

Project Details

Registry	ACR Standard
Registry ID	ACR-773
Sector	other
Country	United States
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	Methodology for the Quantification, Monitoring, Reporting and Verification of the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions and Removals from Certified Reclaimed HFC Refrigerants 2.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2036
VVB	First Environment, Inc.
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Leakage is treated inconsistently: the PDD deems it negligible, while the monitoring/verification record indicates leakage was not addressed.
- Safeguards are inconsistent: the PDD mentions safeguards, but the monitoring/verification record indicates safeguards were not mentioned; no FPIC or grievance mechanism is documented.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation).
- Leakage is not clearly quantified or justified in the monitoring/verification record, despite being discussed differently in the PDD.

The validation/verification documentation indicates additionality was assessed using a combined test and confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification report set). The project uses a project-specific baseline approach under the ACR reclaimed HFC refrigerants methodology (PDD). No reversals are reported, which is consistent with an avoidance project type (monitoring/verification record). Integrity is weakened by unclear leakage treatment: the monitoring/verification record indicates leakage was not addressed, and no leakage deduction is evidenced in the extracted record (monitoring/verification record).

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + Independent VVB is identified (First Environment, Inc.) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2021-01-06 to 2021-12-31).
- Key quantified outcomes (claimed and verified emissions reductions) were not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring period (2021-01-06 to 2021-12-31) and the VVB (First Environment, Inc.) are clearly identified (monitoring/verification record). However, the extracted record does not include the total emissions reductions claimed or verified, limiting the ability to independently reconcile issuance quantities (monitoring/verification record). The baseline is described only at a project-specific level, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record (PDD/monitoring record).

Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

- + Not CORSIA-eligible, reducing dual-claiming/aviation-eligibility marketing risk.
- Over-crediting risk is harder to rule out because leakage handling is unclear and ERR totals were not found in the extracted record.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of aviation-related eligibility claims (registry/eligibility record). CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for high-integrity buyer claims. Claim safety is also constrained by potential over-crediting uncertainty because leakage is not clearly addressed in the monitoring/verification record and the extracted record lacks the headline claimed/verified ERR totals needed for external consistency checks (monitoring/verification record).

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.
- Some critical elements are missing or inconsistent across documents (leakage and safeguards), reducing reliability.

Three key documents were used (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is high, supporting a moderate-to-strong documentation score (document set). No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which suggests a clean assurance outcome (verification report). Nonetheless, documentation quality is reduced by internal inconsistencies on leakage and safeguards between the PDD and later monitoring/verification materials, indicating gaps in how key topics were carried through to MRV (PDD vs monitoring/verification record).

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined additionality test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage not clearly treated in monitoring/verification record
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced consistently
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide explicit leakage assessment in the monitoring/verification package (quantify and/or justify negligible leakage and state any deduction applied).

→ Publish a clear safeguards package (stakeholder engagement summary, grievance mechanism, and any applicable social/environmental risk management) and ensure it is carried through into monitoring/verification reporting.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification 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-DC9F8E72 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy