

## QUALITY REPORT

# Dak Srong 3B Hydropower Plant

CT-356 · I-REC · Vietnam

Report ID: CM-090BA038 · 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

Only minimal project identifiers were provided, with no extracted content from official documents to substantiate baseline setting, additionality, monitoring, or issuance details. With zero documents and low extraction confidence, the project cannot be quality-assessed beyond a very conservative, high-uncertainty score.

## Project Details

Registry	I-REC
Registry ID	CT-356
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Vietnam
Vintage	2022
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No official documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of baseline, monitoring, and issuance claims
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or misread critical information

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.0 / 10

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

~ Hydropower is an avoidance-type renewable project, but without documentation the baseline and grid emissions assumptions cannot be validated

No project documents (PDD, monitoring report, or verification/assurance report) were provided in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline selection, and leakage treatment are not stated in available documents. Buffering, reversal events, and any material findings/corrective actions are also not found in the extracted record. Given hydropower's sensitivity to baseline/grid factor assumptions, the absence of documentation materially weakens integrity confidence.

### Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB/assurance information, monitoring period, or MRV details were found in the extracted record

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were provided

The extracted record contains no evidence documents and therefore no information on monitoring periods, metering/QA-QC procedures, or third-party assurance. The VVB/assurance entity name and any discrepancy between claimed and verified results are not stated in available documents. As a result, transparency is scored very low.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, grid factor/FNRB approach, and verified vs claimed results are not available

~ CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in available documents, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unresolved

Without baseline method details, grid emissions factor/FNRB approach, or any comparison of claimed versus verified outcomes, over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated. Eligibility signals such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status are not stated in available documents, so potential double-claim/marketing risk cannot be screened. This uncertainty drives a conservative claim-safety score.

### Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- No evidence documents were provided (0 documents used), so key claims are unsupported

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability of the extracted record

No evidence documents were included (0 documents used), and the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable. Key fields typically needed for assessment (methodology, monitoring, verification/assurance, findings) are not found in the extracted record. This results in a very low documentation score (note: documentation < 3.0 would cap transparency under the gate rules).

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality assessment found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Reversal/buffering not documented
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not found
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not found
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the I-REC registration/issuance documentation and any assurance/verification statement covering the monitoring period and metering QA/QC

→ Provide the baseline/grid emissions factor approach (including data sources and vintage) and any leakage/safeguards documentation to enable an over-crediting and safeguards review

### 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-090BA038 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy