

QUALITY REPORT

Bangna Starch Wastewater Treatment and Biogas Utilization Project (300084)_pre-CDM VER

GS-1190 · GS · Thailand

Report ID: CM-36320477 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.3Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
■ Transparency (25%)	4.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
■ Documentation (15%)	3.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a defined project baseline, but the verification report also lists many corrective actions and material findings. Transparency is limited by missing or unstated emissions and usage data, and permanence/leakage treatment is weakly documented for a biogas project. Overall, the evidence base is usable but not strong, with notable documentation gaps and reliability concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1190
Sector	biogas
Country	Thailand
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS III.H Version 09
Crediting Period	null
VVB	Germanischer Lloyd Certification GmbH
Monitoring Period	2008 — 2009
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The verification report lists 12 corrective actions and 15 findings in total, which suggests substantial issues at verification.
- Leakage, reversal risk, and key monitoring details are not addressed clearly in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test, which supports the project case.

- The verification report records 12 corrective actions and 15 findings, indicating material implementation or documentation weaknesses.

The verification report from Germanischer Lloyd Certification GmbH confirms additionality through an investment test, which is a meaningful positive signal. However, the same report lists 12 corrective actions and 15 findings, so the project does not appear cleanly documented or fully robust at verification. Baseline method is described as project-based, but baseline reassessment timing, leakage treatment, and reversal handling are not clearly stated in the extracted record.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier, Germanischer Lloyd Certification GmbH, and a defined monitoring period from 2008-11-10 to 2009-11-09.

- Claimed and verified emission reduction totals are not stated in the extracted record, and key monitoring methods are also not found.

Transparency is moderate at best because the project has a named verifier and a clear monitoring period, but the extracted record does not provide claimed or verified emission reduction totals. Key MRV details such as usage monitoring method and usage rates are also not found. The absence of these figures limits the ability to independently assess performance and registry completeness.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

+ The project uses an established biogas methodology, AMS III.H Version 09, which is a positive sign for methodological clarity.

- Leakage treatment is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated, which raises over-crediting risk for a biogas electricity project.

Claim safety is weakened by missing leakage treatment and by the lack of quantified emissions data in the extracted record. The methodology is identified as AMS III.H Version 09, which helps, but the project-specific baseline and unaddressed leakage create over-crediting risk. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market risk cannot be ruled out from the available evidence.

Documentation — 3.2 / 10

+ The evidence set includes a PDD, verification report, and monitoring report, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- The crediting period is not stated, and the verification report contains many corrective actions, suggesting incomplete or weak documentation.

The documentation set is broader than a single report, with a PDD, verification report, and monitoring report included, and extraction confidence is medium. Even so, the crediting period is not stated, several key fields are missing, and the verification report contains numerous corrective actions. That combination points to incomplete documentation quality rather than a fully mature evidence package.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide quantified verified emission reductions, leakage treatment, and the monitoring calculations used for the reporting period.

→ Disclose the crediting period, any buffer or reversal provisions, and close out or explain all corrective actions from verification.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_10-11-08 to 09-11-09_v5.2.pdf
- Monitoring Report_monitoring period_10-11-2008 to 09-11-2009_v05.pdf
- PDD_25-09-09.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1190
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1190
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_10-11-08 to 09-11-09_v5.0.pdf
- Verification Report_monitoring period_10-11-2008 to 09-1-2009_v03.pdf
- Verification Report_monitoring period_10-11-2008 to 09-1-2009_v04.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-36320477 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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