

QUALITY REPORT

Bangkok Kamphaeng Saen East: Landfill Gas to Electricity Project

GS-226 · GS · Thailand

Report ID: CM-3B57A662 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.7 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This landfill gas project has some strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality, FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and a named verifier. However, the record also shows many corrective actions and clarification requests, missing leakage justification in the latest verification record, and several key values that are either not stated or inconsistent across documents. Overall, the project looks usable but not especially robust from a credit-quality perspective.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-226
Sector	methane
Country	Thailand
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	ACM0001 ver. 11
Crediting Period	2011 — 2018
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Verified ERs	442,433 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	23 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- The latest verification record lists many corrective actions and clarifications, suggesting material documentation and monitoring weaknesses.
- Leakage is shown as a 0% deduction, but the latest verification report says the justification was not addressed.
- Several core figures conflict across documents, including credited emissions, baseline-related values, and the treatment of reversal events.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, and the verification record indicates a combined additionality test rather than a purely qualitative claim.

- The latest verification report records numerous corrective action requests and clarifications, and leakage justification is marked as not addressed.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and names TÜV NORD CERT GmbH as the VVB, which supports the core project case. At the same time, the latest verification record lists many corrective action requests and clarifications, and the leakage justification is not addressed even though a 0% deduction is shown. Reversal risk is also not cleanly resolved because the record says special events occurred during the monitoring period, while reversal events are otherwise not addressed in the extracted facts.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and both claimed and verified emission reductions are available in the verification record.

- Several important monitoring details are not stated in available documents, including the usage monitoring method and the verified usage rate.

Transparency is moderate because the project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and both claimed and verified emission reductions are available. However, the usage monitoring method and verified usage rate are not stated in available documents, which limits MRV clarity. The record also shows a small gap between claimed and verified reductions, which is not large but still reduces confidence in reporting precision.

Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

+ The project uses ACM0001 for landfill gas to electricity, which is a recognized methodology for this sector.

- The latest verification report shows a 0% leakage deduction without a supporting justification, and the claimed versus verified ER figures differ slightly.

Claim safety is weakened by the latest verification report's 0% leakage deduction paired with a leakage justification marked as not addressed. The project uses ACM0001, which is appropriate for landfill gas to electricity, but the absence of a clear leakage explanation and the small discrepancy between claimed and verified ER figures increase over-crediting concern. CORSIA eligibility is marked true, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-channel risk is not fully resolved.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ The record includes multiple official document types, with 21 extracted facts and a medium extraction confidence level.

- The latest verification report contains many corrective actions, and some key fields are missing or only partially specified in the extracted record.

Documentation is fair but not strong: the record draws from multiple official documents and includes a named verifier, monitoring period, and crediting period. Still, the latest verification report contains many corrective actions and the extraction confidence is only medium, indicating some readability or completeness limitations. The crediting period and monitoring period are also not perfectly aligned across documents, which adds to the documentation uncertainty.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed test
● Permanence	reversal risk not clearly resolved
● Leakage	0% deduction without clear justification
● 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 leakage assessment and justification for the 0% deduction, with supporting calculations in the monitoring report.

→ Resolve the monitoring and verification inconsistencies by reconciling reversal-event treatment, credited emissions, and all corrective actions in a single updated disclosure.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_7th monitoring period_01.11.2015 to 31.10.2016_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_8th monitoring period_01.11.2016 to 20.01.2018_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.06.2011 to 31.10.2011_v1.pdf
- (2)Monitoring Report_5th monitoring period_01.10.2013 to 31.10.2014_v4.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.11.2011 to 31.03.2012_v2.pdf
- (2)Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01.04.2012 to 30.09.2013_v4.pdf
- Monitoring Report_6th monitoring period_01.11.2014 to 31.10.2015_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_21.01.2011 to 31.05.2011_v1.pdf
- (1)GS Passport 29.08.2013_v13.pdf
- (1)PDD 13.01.2014_v16.pdf
- PDD 13.01.2014_v16.pdf
- PDD 02.07.2012_v9.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-226
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-226
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01.06.2011 to 31.10.2011_v2.pdf
- Verification Report_8th monitoring period_01.11.2016 to 20.01.2018_v1.1.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01.11.2011 to 31.03.2012_v7.pdf
- GS1371 Validation Report_18.01.2011_v3.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_4th monitoring period_01.04.2012 to 30.09.2013_v1.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_5th monitoring period_01.10.2013 to 31.10.2014_v1.pdf
- Verification Report_7th monitoring period_01.11.2015 to 31.10.2016_v1.pdf
- Verification Report_6th monitoring period_01.11.2014 to 31.10.2015_v1.1.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_21.01.2011 to 31.05.2011_v5.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-3B57A662 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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