

QUALITY REPORT

Univanich Lamthap POME Biogas Project PreCDMVER

GS-1233 · GS · Thailand

Report ID: CM-AEEA4B2C · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including VVB involvement, FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and a stated barrier additionality test. However, the record is weak on key credit-quality items such as quantified leakage treatment, buffer protection, and verified additionality details, and the verification report raised many corrective items. Overall, the documentation suggests a project that was reviewed but not cleanly evidenced for high-confidence claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1233
Sector	biogas
Country	Thailand
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AM0022 version 4
VVB	SIRIM QAS International Sdn Bhd
Monitoring Period	2008 — 2009
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- The verification report recorded 5 CARs and 17 CLs after the on-site audit, indicating substantial issues needing follow-up.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent: the monitoring report says leakage is negligible, while the verification report says it was not addressed.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ The project used a barrier additionality test and was reviewed by SIRIM QAS International Sdn Bhd, which supports some additionality credibility.

- Leakage is not consistently justified, and no buffer pool or reversal protection details were found in the extracted record.

The project has some integrity support because the PDD and verification materials indicate a barrier-based additionality approach, and the verification was performed by SIRIM QAS International Sdn Bhd. That said, leakage is weakly supported: the monitoring report says it is negligible under AM0022v4, but the verification report says leakage was not addressed, and no buffer pool or reversal protection details were found. The large number of CARs and CLs also weakens confidence in the robustness of the project design and implementation.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has three evidence documents available, including a verification report, monitoring report, and PDD, and the monitoring period is stated.

- Key MRV fields such as claimed versus verified ERs, usage monitoring, and baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents.

Transparency is moderate but incomplete. The record identifies the VVB, methodology version, and monitoring period, and it includes three document types, but key MRV outputs such as claimed versus verified emissions reductions are not stated in available documents. Usage monitoring method, FNRB method, and baseline reassessment timing are also not found, limiting public traceability of the accounting.

Claim Safety — 4.1 / 10

- The baseline is described only as project-based, with no recent reassessment or standardized baseline evidence found.

~ Leakage treatment is disputed across documents, with the monitoring report describing it as negligible but the verification report saying it was not addressed.

Claim safety is limited by missing and inconsistent core accounting information. The baseline is only described as project-based, with no evidence of a recent reassessment or standardized baseline, and leakage treatment is contradictory across documents. No CORSIA eligibility or CCP status is stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ The extraction confidence is high and the record includes multiple official document types plus a named VVB.

- The verification report dated 2011-11-30 lists 5 CARs and 17 CLs, showing material documentation and audit issues.

Documentation quality is mixed. On the positive side, the extraction confidence is high and the record draws from a verification report, monitoring report, and PDD. On the negative side, the verification report dated 2011-11-30 lists 5 CARs and 17 CLs, which suggests substantial audit follow-up was needed, and several important fields remain unstated in the available documents.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Barrier test present but not independently confirmed in extr
● Permanence	No buffer pool or reversal protection details found
● Leakage	Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, but reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are documente
● Double-claim	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, reconciled leakage assessment with quantified treatment and audit evidence supporting the final value.

→ Publish verified ER figures, baseline reassessment details, and explicit CORSIA/CCP status to reduce claim and double-counting uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_13-03-08 to 31-01-09_v5.1.doc
- PDD_08-08-2008.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1233
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1233
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_13-03-08 to 31-01-09_v3.0.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-AEEA4B2C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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