

## QUALITY REPORT

# CYY Biopower Wastewater treatment plant including biogas reuse for thermal oil replacement and electricity generation Project, Thailand (300059)\_pre-CDM VER

GS-1189 · GS · Thailand

Report ID: CM-817287F8 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.9**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.2</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.8</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.6</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported reversal events, but the evidence base is weakened by monitoring gaps and several corrective actions requested by the verifier. Leakage is treated as negligible in the verification report, yet the monitoring report appears to have used a quantified approach, creating a documentation inconsistency that reduces confidence. Overall, this is a moderate-quality file with meaningful uncertainty around monitoring completeness and claim robustness.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1189
Sector	biomass
Country	Thailand
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AM0022 04 of EB28 valid from 21/12/2006
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	RINA Services S.p.A.
Verified ERs	14,657 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2008 — 2009
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

## Red Flags

- The verifier requested revisions because the project was not monitoring combustion efficiency and other required parameters during the monitoring period.
- There is a contradiction on leakage treatment: the verification report says leakage is negligible, while the monitoring report is described as using a quantified approach.
- The crediting period differs between the PDD and the verification report, which raises documentation consistency concerns.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test, which supports the project's baseline and additionality case.
- The verifier listed multiple corrective actions, including missing monitoring of combustion efficiency and incomplete monitoring-plan implementation, which weakens confidence in the emissions reductions.

The verification report confirms additionality through a barrier test and says the methodology is AM0022 version 4, which supports the project design case. However, the same report lists several material findings, including that the project was not monitoring combustion efficiency and that some required monitoring parameters were not being used in the calculations, so the integrity score is pulled down. No reversal events are reported, but buffer coverage is not stated in the available documents.

### Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period, verifier name, methodology, and claimed versus verified emission reductions are stated in the available documents, and the claimed and verified totals match at 14,657.
- Key monitoring details are not stated in available documents, including the usage monitoring method, and the verifier asked for revisions to the monitoring report and supporting evidence.

The file includes a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and both claimed and verified emission reductions at 14,657, which is a positive sign for traceability. At the same time, important monitoring details are not stated in available documents, including the usage monitoring method and several parameter definitions, and the verifier requested revisions to the monitoring report. The extraction confidence is medium, so documentation quality is not severely impaired, but it is not fully robust either.

### Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The verification report states no difference between claimed and verified emission reductions, which reduces immediate over-crediting concern.
- Leakage treatment is not fully consistent across documents, and the project is not shown to have CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval, leaving claim-channel risk unresolved.

Claim safety is moderate because the claimed and verified emission reductions match exactly in the verification report, which reduces immediate over-crediting concern. Still, the leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: the verification report says leakage is negligible, while the monitoring report is described as using a quantified approach, and the project's CORSIA and CCP status are not established. That combination leaves some residual risk around how safely the credits can be marketed.

### Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + Three official document types were used, including the PDD, monitoring report, and verification report, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- The verifier requested English translations and additional supporting evidence, indicating incomplete documentation quality and reviewability.

The record draws on three official documents, which is a reasonable base, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low. Even so, the verifier requested a revised monitoring plan, a revised monitoring report, English translations, and additional supporting evidence, showing that the documentation package was incomplete at the time of verification. The crediting period also differs between the PDD and the verification report, which further weakens documentation consistency.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal events, buffer not stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Negligible claim but inconsistent treatment
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC noted, grievance mechanism not stated
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, internally consistent monitoring package with all required parameters, translated supporting evidence, and a clear reconciliation of claimed versus verified reductions.

→ Clarify leakage treatment, buffer coverage, and market-eligibility status, including whether the project is CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved.

## Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_25-05-08 to 24-03-09\_v1.5.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report\_monitoring period\_25-05-2008 to 24-03-2009\_v1.4.pdf
- PDD\_09-03-09.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1189
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1189
- (1)Verification Report\_1st monitoring period\_25-05-08 to 24-03-09\_v2.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report\_monitoring period\_25-05-2008 to 24-03-2009\_v1.1.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-817287F8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)