

QUALITY REPORT

A-Gas V10

CM-7d10e0 · ACR Standard · United States

Report ID: CM-E9472A59 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.5

Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| ■ Integrity (35%) | 6.6 |
| ■ Transparency (25%) | 6.2 |
| ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 6.8 |
| ■ Documentation (15%) | 6.0 |

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

Assessment Summary

This ACR refrigerant reclamation project has VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported reversals, which supports core integrity for an avoidance credit type. However, key quantification fields (verified and claimed ERs, leakage deduction) are not present in the extracted record, and there are inconsistencies across documents on leakage framing and safeguards, increasing uncertainty and over-crediting/claims risk.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Registry | ACR Standard |
| Registry ID | CM-7d10e0 |
| Sector | methane |
| Country | United States |
| Vintage | 2021 |
| Project Methodology | Methodology for the Quantification, Monitoring, Reporting and Verification of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions and Removals from Certified Reclaimed HFC Refrigerants, Propellants, and Fire Suppressants 2.0 |
| Crediting Period | 2021 — 2061 |
| VVB | First Environment, Inc. |
| Monitoring Period | 2021 — 2021 |
| Confidence | Medium |
| Documents Reviewed | 3 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-02 |

Red Flags

- Verified and claimed emissions reductions are not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess over-crediting risk.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (described as “not applicable” vs “negligible”), and no leakage deduction percentage is provided.
- Safeguards are inconsistently reported between the PDD and monitoring report, and FPIC/grievance mechanism are indicated as absent.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.6 / 10

- + The verification report confirms additionality using a combined test and reports no material findings.
- Baseline is project-specific and the last baseline reassessment timing is not stated in available documents; leakage deduction is also not found in the extracted record.

The verification report confirms additionality via a combined test and reports no material findings, which supports additionality robustness. The project is an avoidance activity with no reversals reported, but there is no buffer pool percentage found in the extracted record. Baseline setting is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, and leakage deduction is not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty around net ER integrity.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

- + Independent VVB is identified (First Environment, Inc.) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2021-01-07 to 2021-12-31).
- The extracted record does not include claimed vs verified emissions reductions, limiting MRV transparency and comparability.

The VVB is clearly identified as First Environment, Inc., and the monitoring period is specified as 2021-01-07 through 2021-12-31 (monitoring report/verification package). However, the extracted record does not include total emissions reductions claimed or verified, preventing a basic cross-check of reported vs verified outcomes. Several corrective actions in the verification report (e.g., missing monitoring task description and incorrect methodology title in the project plan) also suggest avoidable clarity gaps.

Claim Safety — 6.8 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream double-claiming/eligibility risks.
- Missing ER totals and unclear leakage handling increase the risk that issued credits could be perceived as overstated or hard to substantiate.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain high-profile eligibility-based claims. Still, because the extracted record lacks both claimed and verified ER totals, it is difficult to substantiate the magnitude of climate benefit and assess over-crediting risk. In addition, leakage is framed inconsistently across documents and no leakage deduction percentage is provided, which can undermine confidence in net credit calculations.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Multiple core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence.
- The verification report lists several corrective actions required in the project plan (e.g., missing monitoring task description and incorrect methodology title), indicating documentation quality issues.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, and extraction confidence is high, supporting a moderate documentation score. The verification report nevertheless identifies multiple corrective actions required in the project plan (imprecise coordinates, incomplete monitoring personnel listing, incorrect methodology title, and missing written monitoring task description), indicating that key project documentation needed fixes. Safeguards-related fields (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are indicated as absent, and safeguards reporting is inconsistent across documents.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| ● Additionality | VVB-confirmed combined additionality test |
| ● Permanence | Avoidance project; no reversals reported |
| ● Leakage | Leakage framing inconsistent; deduction not provided |
| ● Baseline | Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear |
| ● Safeguards | Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced consistently |
| ● Double-claim | Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/clearly extract total emissions reductions claimed and verified for the monitoring period, including calculation spreadsheets and any uncertainty/QA-QC summaries.

→ Clarify leakage treatment in a single consistent statement across PDD/validation/monitoring documents and disclose any applicable leakage deduction (even if 0%) with justification.

→ Close out the verification report corrective actions by updating the project plan (accurate coordinates, correct methodology title, complete monitoring roles, and a written monitoring task description).

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-E9472A59 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy