

QUALITY REPORT

DG_Yongheng Project

CT-447 · I-REC · China

Report ID: CM-E851A936 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation beyond basic identifiers, so additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and MRV quality cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high due to lack of verifiable evidence.

Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	CT-447
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	China
Vintage	2022
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, and monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, increasing the risk that critical constraints or findings were missed.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions are not stated in available documents.

~ Project is labeled as renewable energy avoidance, but the absence of baseline and MRV evidence makes integrity indeterminable.

No project documents (PDD, monitoring report, or verification report) were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. Because the project is an avoidance renewable energy activity, integrity depends heavily on baseline and MRV details that are missing here. This warrants a very conservative integrity score.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed results are available in the extracted record.

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

The extracted record contains no VVB name, monitoring period, or any claimed-versus-verified results from a monitoring or verification report. With no evidence documents listed, public traceability and MRV transparency cannot be evaluated. Transparency is therefore scored very low.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- No information on baseline method, grid factors, usage/production monitoring, or eligibility statuses was found, elevating greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

~ No contradictions were detected, but this is likely due to missing documents rather than confirmed consistency.

Key claim-safety elements—baseline method, any grid emission factor approach, and whether results were independently verified—are not stated in available documents. Eligibility indicators (such as CORSIA or CCP status) are also not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot assess double-claiming channel risk from the available evidence. Given these gaps, the risk of overstated claims is high.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- Zero evidence documents were captured (0 documents used), indicating severe documentation gaps.

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability of any conclusions drawn from the extracted record.

The extracted record shows 0 documents used and an empty evidence document list, indicating that core documentation was not available for assessment. The minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability. Documentation is therefore scored near the floor (note: documentation < 3.0 would cap transparency under the stated gate rules).

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Avoidance type but no evidence of reversal provisions
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	Eligibility/status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the core document set (program/project description, monitoring report, and independent verification/assurance statement) with clear dates, monitoring period, and verified MWh/ERR figures.
- Disclose baseline approach (including grid emission factor source/method and any reassessment timing), leakage assessment/deduction (if applicable), and registry/eligibility statuses to reduce over-crediting and double-claiming risk.

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-E851A936 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy