

QUALITY REPORT

UPOIC Wastewater Treatment for Energy Generation, Krabi

GS-1135 · GS · Thailand

Report ID: CM-3EDE458F · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated leakage deduction of 0%, but key risk areas are weakly documented. Transparency is limited by missing verification totals, no usage monitoring method, and no clear public evidence on CORSIA or CCP status. Overall, the record is usable but not especially robust, with several unresolved documentation gaps and a few contradictions that reduce confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1135
Sector	biogas
Country	Thailand
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-III.H GS.2.0
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
VVB	Swiss Carbon Assets Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- Leakage is not clearly justified in the extracted record, even though the project type can have leakage considerations.
- No buffer pool percentage, reversal history, or verified usage monitoring method was found in the available documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which is stronger than an unverified claim.
- Leakage justification is marked as not addressed, and reversal risk is only described in general terms rather than with a buffer or event record.

The verification record confirms additionality through an investment test and says the VVB accepted the project, which supports the core project logic. However, leakage justification is marked as not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not found, and reversal handling is only described in broad terms. The project therefore looks moderately credible, but not strongly insulated against baseline or permanence concerns.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The monitoring period and crediting period are both stated, and the VVB is named as Swiss Carbon Assets Ltd.
- No verified emission reduction totals, usage monitoring method, or FNRB information were found in the extracted record.

The documents identify the VVB, the monitoring period, and the crediting period, which helps anchor the record. Still, the extracted facts do not include verified emission reduction totals, a usage monitoring method, or any FNRB method/value, so the MRV trail is incomplete. The medium extraction confidence also suggests at least one source was not perfectly readable, which lowers transparency confidence.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline and a 0% leakage deduction is stated, which helps limit over-crediting risk if the underlying justification is sound.
- CORSIA eligibility is not stated and CCP status is only noted as not mentioned, leaving dual-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is helped by the project-specific baseline and the stated 0% leakage deduction, but the leakage rationale itself is not clearly documented. CORSIA eligibility is not stated and CCP status is only noted as not mentioned, so there is no strong evidence that dual-market claim risk is excluded. The contradiction on leakage treatment, where one document reportedly quantified it and a later one says it was not addressed, further weakens confidence.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + Eleven documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- Material findings required corrective action on monitoring calculations and sustainable development reporting, showing the documentation needed cleanup.

The record draws on eleven documents, and the extraction confidence is medium, which is acceptable but not strong. Two corrective-action items were raised in verification, including a wrong MCF_{ww} value and missing sustainable development monitoring results, indicating that the documentation package needed revision. The crediting period also appears in two different forms across documents, which suggests version control issues even though the later date was likely the more authoritative record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No buffer pool found
● Leakage	0% deduction with weak justification
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear leakage assessment, including the basis for the 0% deduction and any supporting calculations.

→ Provide verified emission reduction totals, usage monitoring details, and explicit CORSIA/CCP status in the registry record.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_monitoring period_06-05-2014 to 31-07-2014_v2.0.PDF
- (1)Monitoring Report_[X] monitoring period_05.06.2014 to 07.31.2014_v3.pdf
- Monitoring Report_monitoring period_18-10-2011 to 31-07-2014_v5.0.pdf
- GS Passport_07.07.2016_v5.pdf
- GS Passport_09-12-2014.pdf
- DEV_354.pdf
- PDD_07.08.2015_v12.pdf
- PDD_21-02-2009.doc
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1135
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1135
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_05.06.2014 to 07.31.2014_v2.pdf
- Verification Report_monitoring period_18-10-2011 to 31-07-2014.pdf
- Verification Report_monitoring period_18-10-2011 to 17-10-2021_v2.0.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-3EDE458F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy