

QUALITY REPORT

Song Ong Hydropower Project

VCS-836 · VCS · Viet Nam

Report ID: CM-461CAD75 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project has VVB-confirmed additionality and uses a recognized small-scale grid-connected renewable methodology, but several corrective actions and internal inconsistencies across documents raise reliability and over-crediting concerns. Leakage and safeguards treatment is inconsistently documented, and key quantitative fields (e.g., claimed ERR, leakage deduction) are missing from the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-836
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Viet Nam
Vintage	2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 16
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	TUV SUD
Verified ERs	19,366 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large discrepancy in verified emission reductions across validation reports (19,366 vs 127,120), indicating potential data reliability or boundary/method changes.
- Multiple corrective actions note inability to confirm key monitoring evidence due to documents in local language and missing calibration certificates, increasing MRV risk.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports (deemed negligible vs not addressed), with no quantified leakage deduction found in the extracted record.
- Safeguards/FPIC and grievance mechanism are contradictory across documents, increasing social safeguard and reputational risk.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (monitoring report, 2023-02-28).
- Corrective actions flag baseline equation issues and boundary omissions (auxiliary consumption; possible grid import), which can materially affect ERs (monitoring report, 2023-02-28).

Additionality appears reasonably supported because the monitoring report (2023-02-28) states the VVB confirmed additionality using an investment test. However, integrity is weakened by multiple corrective actions indicating methodological/boundary problems, including an incorrect baseline equation and an incomplete project boundary (auxiliary internal consumption) and the need to address likely grid import during outages (monitoring report, 2023-02-28). Leakage is not robustly evidenced: the latest monitoring report treats leakage as negligible, but no leakage deduction percentage is found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + VVB is identified (TUV SUD) and a specific monitoring period is stated (2018-03-01 to 2019-03-23) (monitoring report, 2023-02-28).
- Claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record and ER figures conflict across documents, reducing traceability (validation reports, 2020-11-07 vs 2023-09-13).

Core MRV identifiers are present (VVB name TUV SUD; monitoring period 2018-03-01 to 2019-03-23) in the monitoring report (2023-02-28). Transparency is reduced because total claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record, and the verified ER figure is inconsistent across validation reports (2020-11-07 vs 2023-09-13). The monitoring report (2023-02-28) also notes the VVB could not confirm some evidence because documents were in local language, limiting auditability for external reviewers.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (extracted record).
- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory ER totals and unresolved MRV/boundary corrective actions (monitoring report, 2023-02-28; validation reports, 2020-11-07 vs 2023-09-13).

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims (extracted record). Nonetheless, claim safety is constrained by over-crediting signals: ER totals differ substantially between validation reports (127,120 vs 19,366), and corrective actions highlight boundary and baseline-calculation issues that can change credited volumes (monitoring report, 2023-02-28). Leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports and not quantified in the extracted record, adding uncertainty to net climate benefit claims.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

- + A relatively broad document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 16 documents used and high extraction confidence (extracted record).
- Numerous corrective actions request missing/unclear evidence (undertaking on double counting, grievance register, invoices/plant records, calibration certificates), indicating documentation gaps (monitoring report, 2023-02-28).

Documentation coverage is moderate-to-good in breadth (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 16 documents used and high extraction confidence (extracted record). However, the monitoring report (2023-02-28) lists many corrective actions requesting missing or unreviewable supporting evidence (grievance register with translation, invoices/plant records for electricity supplied, calibration certificates), indicating that key substantiation was not readily verifiable. The presence of numerous CARs related to the PDD (typos, boundary tables, policy consideration, baseline equation) also suggests quality-control weaknesses in the document set.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversals evidenced
● Leakage	Negligible claimed but inconsistently addressed
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards/grievance/FPIC inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of ER calculations and totals across the 2020 and 2023 validation/verification materials, including any boundary/method changes and corrected baseline equations.

→ Provide complete, translated monitoring evidence (electricity export records for the full monitoring period, meter calibration certificates, and a maintained grievance register) and explicitly state/quantify leakage treatment (even if 0%) with justification.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- 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-461CAD75 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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