QUALITY REPORT

Bangna Starch Wastewater Treatment and Biogas Utilization Project (300084) (GS565 CER to VER conversion)

GS-1707 · GS · Thailand

Report ID: CM-317CD1B9 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
4.9 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	4.8
	Transparency (25%)	5.2
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, the verification report shows many corrective actions and clarifications, leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, and the project is marked CORSIA-eligible with no CCP status stated, which keeps claim safety moderate at best.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1707
Sector	biogas
Country	Thailand
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-III.H version 09 of 14/03/2008
Crediting Period	2009 — 2016
VVB	RINA Services SpA
Verified ERs	105,417 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- ■ The verification report lists ten corrective actions and three clarifications, indicating material documentation and implementation issues.
- ■ Leakage is inconsistent: the monitoring report says it was negligible, while the verification report says it was not addressed.
- ■ The project is CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated, leaving dual-claim risk unresolved.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB through an investment test in the verification report.

- The verification report records ten corrective actions and three clarifications, and leakage treatment is disputed between documents.

The verification report confirms additionality through an investment test and names RINA Services SpA as the VVB, which supports the project's core integrity case. But the same report lists ten corrective actions and three clarifications, and reversal risk is not clearly addressed because reversal events are not discussed and no buffer pool is stated. Leakage is also weakly supported because the monitoring report says it was negligible, while the verification report says it was not addressed.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, RINA Services SpA, and a defined monitoring period in the verification report.

- Claimed versus verified issuance cannot be compared because the claimed amount is not found in the extracted record, and several key monitoring details are not stated.

Transparency is mixed: the project has a named verifier and a clear monitoring period in the verification report, which helps traceability. However, the extracted record does not state the claimed issuance amount, several monitoring details are missing, and the project's leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents. The absence of a stated FNRB method and usage monitoring method also limits public MRV clarity.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project uses an established CDM methodology, AMS-III.H, and the verification report confirms additionality.

- Leakage justification is inconsistent across the monitoring and verification reports, and the project is marked CORSIA-eligible with no CCP status stated.

Claim safety is constrained by the leakage contradiction and by the lack of a stated CCP status. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which means it is not automatically insulated from dual-claim concerns, and the record does not show any explicit exclusion from CCP-style claims. The use of AMS-III.H and VVB-confirmed additionality are positives, but they do not fully offset the uncertainty around over-crediting and claim overlap.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ Four evidence documents were used, and extraction confidence is high.

- The verification report is burdened by many corrective actions, and the crediting period differs from the PDD, reducing documentation reliability.

Documentation breadth is decent because four official document types were used, and extraction confidence is high. Still, the verification report contains many corrective actions and clarifications, suggesting the file required substantial cleanup before approval. The crediting period also differs from the PDD, and key fields such as buffer pool coverage and several monitoring parameters are not stated in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No buffer pool stated
Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of leakage treatment and quantify any deduction using the most recent verified monitoring evidence.

→ Provide a complete registry and claims-status trail, including CCP status, issuance totals, and any buffer or reversal handling.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_10.11.2009 to 31.12.2010_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.08.2013 to 09.11.2016_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.01.2011 to 31.07.2013_v1.pdf
- PDD 11.08.2011_v4.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1707
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1707
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01.01.2011 to 31.07.2013_v1.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_10.11.2009 to 31.12.2010_v1.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01.08.2013 to 09.11.2016_v1.2Aa.pdf
- Validation Report 10.11.2009.pdf

Report ID: CM-317CD1B9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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