

QUALITY REPORT

Biogas Program for the Animal Husbandry Sector of Vietnam

GS-61 · GS · Viet Nam

Report ID: CM-D1F5CAE2 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.7
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strong procedural elements, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a stated leakage treatment, and documented safeguards. However, reliability is weakened by multiple contradictions across documents, a large set of corrective actions and material findings, and uncertainty around the true emission reductions and usage rates.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-61
Sector	biogas
Country	Viet Nam
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption 1.0
Crediting Period	2010 — 2017
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Verified ERs	709,192 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2015 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	29 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The verification record shows many material findings and corrective actions, which raises confidence concerns.
- Key figures conflict across documents, including emission reductions, leakage treatment, usage rates, and the crediting period.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by TÜV NORD CERT GmbH in the verification report, using a combined test approach.
- The verification report lists many material findings and corrective actions, and leakage treatment conflicts with earlier documents.

The verification report from TÜV NORD CERT GmbH confirms additionality, which supports the project's core eligibility case. Still, the report also lists many material findings and corrective actions, and the leakage treatment is not fully consistent across documents, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the crediting basis. The project uses a project baseline, but the baseline was not shown to have been recently reassessed.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + The monitoring and verification records identify the monitoring period and the VVB, and the project has multiple official documents in the extracted set.
- Several core figures are inconsistent across documents, including emission reductions, usage rates, leakage, and the crediting period.

The project has identifiable monitoring and verification documentation, including a defined monitoring period and named VVB. However, the record contains major inconsistencies in reported emission reductions, usage rates, leakage treatment, and the crediting period, which makes the public record less reliable. The medium extraction confidence also suggests at least one key source was not perfectly readable.

Claim Safety — 3.7 / 10

- + The project is described as using a project baseline, with a leakage deduction stated as 0% in the verification record and safeguards mentioned.
- The project is marked as CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not mentioned, and the emission reduction totals differ sharply between validation and verification records.

Claim safety is weakened by the large discrepancy between emission reductions in the validation and verification records, which creates over-crediting risk. The project is marked as CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not mentioned, so dual-channel claim risk is not fully resolved. On the positive side, the project states a project baseline and a leakage deduction of 0% with a negligible-leakage justification in the verification report.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + The record includes a substantial document set, including monitoring, validation, verification, stakeholder consultation, and PDD materials.
- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report contains numerous corrective actions and unresolved discrepancies.

The evidence base is fairly broad, with monitoring, validation, verification, stakeholder consultation, and PDD documents all represented. Even so, the extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report includes numerous corrective actions, suggesting the documentation package is not cleanly resolved. The crediting period also appears inconsistent across reports, which reduces documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal events reported, but buffer status not stated
● Leakage	Leakage treated inconsistently across documents
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not mentioned

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide a reconciled emissions and leakage table that explains every discrepancy across validation, monitoring, and verification documents.
- Publish a clearer statement on buffer coverage, baseline reassessment, and CCP status, with a documented resolution of all corrective actions.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01-01-2015 to 30-06-2016_v2.1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_28-06-10 to 31-12-11_v2.3.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.01.2012 to 30.06.2013_v3.2.pdf
- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01-01-2015 to 30-06-2016_v2.3.docx
- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01-01-2015 to 30-06-2015_v2.2.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01-07-13 to 31-12-14_v3.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-01-12 to 30-06-13_v3.2.pdf
- _GS1083_Monitoring report MP4_V2.2_20191217_track changes.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_28.06.2010 to 31.12.2011_v2.3.pdf
- GS1083 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report_25.09.2012_v3.1.pdf
- GS Passport_19-07-2006.pdf
- PDD_07-10-2011_v1.pdf
- PDD_24-13-2012.pdf
- PDD_24-09-2012_v3.1.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-61
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-61
- GS1083 Validation Report_26.04.2012_v1.2 (2).pdf
- 2020-01-17 FVerR_Vietnam Biogas 4th GS VER_track.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_28.06.2010 to 31.12.2011_v1.4.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01-07-13 to 31-12-14_v1.2.pdf
- GS1083 Validation Report_25.10.2012_v2.2.pdf
- GS1083 Validation Report_26.04.2012_v1.2.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_28-06-10 to 31-12-11_v1.4.pdf
- Verification Report_4th monitoring period_01-01-2015 to 30-06-2016_v4.pdf
- 2020-01-17 FVerR_Vietnam Biogas 4th GS VER_clean.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01.01.2012 to 30.06.2013_v1.2.pdf
- Verification Report_4th monitoring period_01-01-2015 to 30-06-2016_v2.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-01-12 to 30-06-13_v1.2.pdf
- Verification Report_4th monitoring period_01-01-2015 to 30-06-2016_v3.pdf

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-D1F5CAE2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

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