

QUALITY REPORT

Chumporn applied biogas technology for advanced waste water management

GS-1509 · GS · Thailand

Report ID: CM-CED3F93A · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards, but the evidence is weakened by many unresolved verification findings and missing information on leakage, permanence, and buffer protection. Transparency is limited because key MRV fields are not stated, and the record contains a crediting-period contradiction between the PDD and verification report that reduces confidence in the documentation.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1509
Sector	biogas
Country	Thailand
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AM0013 4.0
Crediting Period	2009 — 2019
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2011
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The verification report lists many findings, including seven corrective action requests and three clarifications, which suggests material documentation or implementation issues.
- Leakage treatment, reversal handling, and buffer pool coverage are not stated in the available documents.
- The crediting period differs between the PDD and the verification report, and the later verification report was privileged because it is more recent and reflects the verified project status.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB through an investment test in the verification report.
- Leakage is not addressed, and reversal risk is not described in the available record.

The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test and says the VVB, TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, validated the project. However, leakage is not addressed, reversal events are not addressed, and there is no buffer pool information, so permanence and leakage robustness remain weak. The large number of findings in the verification report also weighs on integrity.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The project has a named verifier, TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, and a defined monitoring period in the verification report.
- Total verified and claimed emission reductions are not stated, and the usage monitoring method is also not found.

Transparency is only moderate because the project has a named verifier and a clear monitoring period, but key MRV outputs are missing from the extracted record. Total claimed and verified emission reductions are not stated, and the usage monitoring method is not found. The absence of these core figures limits public traceability of the claim.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline under AM0013, which is at least a defined methodology rather than an unstated baseline.
- The record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, and leakage justification is marked as not addressed.

Claim safety is constrained by missing evidence on leakage, permanence, and dual-claim status. The project uses a project-specific baseline under AM0013, but there is no stated leakage deduction and no information on CORSIA eligibility or CCP status. The verified usage rate of 74% is helpful, but without the assumed rate or monitoring method it is hard to judge over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

- + The evidence set includes a PDD, monitoring report, and verification report, with medium extraction confidence.
- The verification report contains many findings, and the crediting period conflict with the PDD indicates a documentation reliability issue.

Documentation quality is mixed: the record draws on a PDD, monitoring report, and verification report, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low. Still, the verification report lists seven corrective action requests and three clarifications, which suggests substantial issues during verification. The crediting period in the verification report differs from the PDD, and I privileged the later verification report because it is more recent and reflects the verified status.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	no leakage treatment stated
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the monitoring calculations, including verified and claimed emission reductions, usage monitoring method, and any leakage treatment.

→ Provide a clear permanence and registry statement, including buffer pool coverage, reversal handling, and explicit CORSIA/CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.09.2010 to 30.09.2011_v5.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_09.02.2009 to 31.08.2010_v4.pdf
- PDD 20.11.2014_v10.pdf
- CDM PDD 15.01.2010_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1509
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1509
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_09.02.2009 to 31.08.2010_v4.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01.09.2010 to 30.09.2011_v1.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-CED3F93A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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