

QUALITY REPORT

Thai Hoa Wind Power Project

GS-3272 · GS · Viet Nam

Report ID: CM-583830F6 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a wind project with a verified additionality assessment and no reported reversal event, but several key items are either not stated or internally inconsistent across documents. The main weaknesses are the lack of clear leakage justification in the verification report, missing public-facing MRV details, and a crediting-period inconsistency that reduces confidence in the record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3272
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Viet Nam
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 20.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2026
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- The verification report says leakage was not addressed, while an older monitoring report described leakage as negligible.
- The crediting period differs between documents, and the reversal-events field is also inconsistent across sources.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under ACM0002 Version 20.0.
- Leakage justification is not addressed in the verification report, and the buffer pool percentage is not found in the extracted record.

The project scores moderately well on integrity because the verification report confirms additionality and identifies a combined additionality test under ACM0002 Version 20.0. The project also reports no extreme event causing reversal in the verification report, but the record does not state a buffer pool percentage and does not clearly explain leakage in the verification report. The absence of a clear leakage rationale and the missing buffer information keep the score below strong-project territory.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

- + A named VVB is identified, and the monitoring period for the latest verification cycle is stated as 2024-01-01 to 2024-12-31.
- Total claimed versus verified emission reductions are not stated, and the monitoring method for usage is not found in available documents.

Transparency is mixed: the VVB is named as 4K Earth Science Private Limited and the latest monitoring period is clearly stated. However, total claimed and verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, and the usage monitoring method is also not stated. The missing MRV quantities and methods limit public auditability.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

- + The project is a wind power activity under Gold Standard, with no extreme event reported as causing a reversal in the verification report.
- Leakage treatment is weakly documented because the verification report does not explain the 0% deduction, and CORSIA eligibility is marked true while CCP status is not stated.

Claim safety is weakened by incomplete leakage documentation and by the fact that CORSIA eligibility is true while CCP status is not stated. The project is a wind project, which generally lowers reversal risk, but the record still contains a contradiction on reversal-events detail between the verification report and a later source. Because the verification report is the more direct assurance document, I privileged its statement that no extreme event was reported, but the inconsistency still reduces confidence.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Multiple evidence documents were used, including the PDD, verification report, monitoring report, and stakeholder consultation material.
- The extraction confidence is only medium, and several corrective action requests were raised, even though they were later closed satisfactorily.

Documentation is reasonably broad, with evidence from the PDD, verification report, monitoring report, and stakeholder consultation materials, and the project also shows a grievance mechanism and FPIC being conducted. Still, the extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report lists five corrective action requests and one clarification request, even though they were later closed satisfactorily. The crediting-period inconsistency between documents also suggests the documentation set is not fully clean.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No reversal event reported
● Leakage	0% deduction, weak justification
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status unstated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear leakage rationale and the basis for the 0% deduction in the latest verification package.

→ Provide a complete MRV summary with claimed and verified issuance figures, usage monitoring details, and a reconciled crediting-period timeline.

Documents Reviewed

- 04_Thai Hoa WPP_V1.3_IQ_SDG-Impact-tool_Updated.xlsx
- 01_GS 11251_MP1_CP1_GS Monitoring Report_Ver 2.1_Clean.pdf
- GS11251 Thai Hota WPP Annual Report 2025.pdf
- 02_GS 11251_Thai Hoa WPP_ER Calculation Sheet_Ver 2.0.xlsx
- Thai Hoa Wind.pdf
- 04_GS11251_Stakeholder Consultation Report_Ver 2.4_Clean.pdf
- 3_ER and Project IRR_Spreadsheet.XLS
- 04_GS11251_SDG-Impact-Tool_Ver 1.0.xlsx
- 05_GS11251_ER and Project IRR_Spreadsheet_Ver 2.2.xlsx
- 02_GS11251_PDD_Thai Hoa Wind Power Project_Ver 2.6_Clean.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3272
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3272
- 04_FVR-Clean_Ver 2.2.pdf
- GS_Verification_report_V2.1-Clean.pdf
- 05_FVR_Ver 1.2.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-583830F6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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