

QUALITY REPORT

Yingpeng HFC23 Decomposition Project

VCS-439 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-3F0140F5 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.0

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.5
■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so key quality determinants (baseline, additionality, monitoring, and findings) cannot be verified. Given the project type (HFC-23 destruction) is historically high-risk for over-crediting and perverse incentives, the absence of evidence materially increases integrity and claim-risk concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-439
Sector	industrial
Country	China
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, monitoring, and verification outcomes
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missed or misread critical details
- HFC-23 destruction projects are widely considered high over-crediting/perverse-incentive risk, but no safeguards or controls are evidenced in the extracted record

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, and any material findings/corrective actions are not found in the extracted record (no documents available)

~ Project type (HFC-23 destruction) is inherently high-risk for over-crediting/perverse incentives, but the extracted record provides no project-specific controls to assess

No baseline method, additionality assessment, leakage approach, buffer/reversal provisions, or verification findings are available in the extracted record because no documents were provided/used. With minimum extraction confidence marked low, even basic integrity checks cannot be reliably performed. Given the industrial HFC-23 destruction context, this evidence gap is particularly material because project-specific controls are essential to rule out over-crediting and perverse incentives.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring/verification details (periods, methods, errors, VVB identity) are found in the extracted record (no documents available)

- Low extraction confidence reduces confidence that public documentation is complete and accurately captured

The extracted record contains no VVB name, monitoring period, monitoring methodology, or verification error checks because no documents were available. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that any public MRV information was captured accurately. As a result, the project is not assessable for MRV transparency based on the provided record.

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- No evidence in the extracted record on baseline stringency, national/default factors, or any checks against over-crediting (no documents available)

~ Eligibility/labels that affect downstream claims (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) are not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for buyers

No information is available in the extracted record on baseline stringency, leakage justification, or any cross-checks that would reduce over-crediting risk. The record also does not include CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, leaving downstream claim risk unresolved. For HFC-23 destruction, this lack of evidence elevates greenwashing risk because buyers cannot substantiate that credited reductions are conservative and non-perverse.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided/used (0 documents), creating a major evidence gap

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating documentation quality/legibility issues

The extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence list, indicating a severe documentation gap. Minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the likelihood of missing critical details. This warrants a very low documentation score and triggers the post-processing gate risk that transparency may be capped due to insufficient documentation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, latest monitoring report, and latest verification report so baseline approach, additionality demonstration, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions can be assessed

→ Provide registry and eligibility information (VVB identity, monitoring periods, issuance details, and any CORSIA/CCP status) and ensure documents are machine-readable to resolve the low extraction confidence

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-3F0140F5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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