QUALITY REPORT

Nam Pha Gnai Hydropower Project

GS-611 · GS · Lao People's Democratic Republic

Report ID: CM-C613A949 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6
Overall Score
out of 10

Integrity (35%)	4.8
Transparency (25%)	4.6
Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a hydropower project with VVB-verified additionality and documented safeguards, but the record has important gaps around leakage, reversals, and quantified issuance/verification results. Several corrective actions and material findings were reported, which lowers confidence in the robustness of the crediting claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-611
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Lao People's Democratic Republic
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 Version 16.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2026
VVB	Shenzhen CTI International Certification Co., Ltd (CTI)
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring record, despite a prior document reportedly describing it as negligible.
- The project has multiple material findings and corrective actions, and the record does not show verified emission reductions for the monitoring period.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was based on an investment test and was confirmed by the VVB, which supports the project's core eligibility case.

- Leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, reversal events are not addressed, and the project had three CARs plus one CL, indicating unresolved robustness issues.

The project's additionality case is stronger than average because the monitoring record says an investment test was used and that the VVB confirmed it. However, leakage is not addressed in the monitoring report, reversal events are also not addressed, and the project had three corrective action requests plus one clarification, which weakens confidence in overall environmental integrity.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period, registry, methodology, methodology version, and VVB name are stated, giving a basic audit trail.

- Total claimed versus verified emission reductions are not stated, and key monitoring details such as usage monitoring and FNRB treatment are missing.

The record identifies the VVB, monitoring period, registry, methodology, and methodology version, which helps with basic traceability. But the extracted facts do not state total claimed or verified emission reductions, and usage monitoring plus FNRB treatment are not found in the available documents, leaving important MRV gaps.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

+ The project uses ACM0002 with a project baseline, and safeguards such as FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are documented.

- Leakage justification is not addressed in the monitoring record, and no verified issuance figures are available to check for over-crediting.

Claim safety is constrained by the lack of verified issuance data and by the unresolved leakage treatment in the monitoring record. The project appears to use a project-specific baseline under ACM0002, and safeguards are documented, but the absence of quantified verification results makes over-crediting risk harder to rule out.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ Multiple official document types were available, and the VVB is named, which supports traceability.

- The extraction confidence is only medium, one document was poorly readable, and the monitoring report contains several corrective actions, reducing documentation quality.

Documentation is moderately complete because several official documents were used and the VVB is identified. Still, the extraction confidence is only medium, one source was poorly readable, and the presence of multiple corrective actions suggests the documentation package was not fully clean or complete.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
Leakage	leakage not addressed in monitoring
Baseline	project baseline, reassessment missing
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete monitoring statement with verified emission reductions, leakage treatment, and any issuance or retirement figures for the monitoring period.

→ Resolve all corrective actions and provide a clear, dated explanation for reversal risk, baseline updates, and the apparent differences between the PDD and monitoring report.

Documents Reviewed

- GS3514_SDG-Impact-tool_ver01_240319.xlsx
- GS3514_NPG_Annual-Report-Form_20221228.docx
- GS3514_NPG_Annual-Report-Form_20241118.pdf
- GS MR_1st Nam Pha Gnai Hydropower Project-GS 3514.doc
- ER for MR_2nd Nam Pha Gnai Hydropower Project_ver02.xlsx
- GS3514_NPG_Annual Report_20251210.pdf
- MR-MP2 NPG GS 3514__ver 03_clean_240111.docx
- EF for MR_1st Nam Pha Gnai Hydropower Project.xlsx
- MR-MP2 NPG GS 3514__ver 03_clean_240111.pdf
- 01. T-V1.0-Transition-Template-GS3514-1207-clean.docx
- 08.ER calculations_NPG.xls
- GS Passport_05.05.2016_v5.pdf
- 01.Design-Change-Memo for NPG project_V2_CLEAN.docx
- GS3514_Transition request form_20221122_20230206.docx
- PDD_11.03.2015_v2.1.pdf
- GS3514_Nam Pha Gnai Hydro_PDD for PRC_track-change.docx
- PDD_03.02.2015_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-611
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-611
- 02.Validation report for PRC- NPG-clean.pdf
- FVerR_Nam Pha Gnai Hydropower Project-CTI-GS 3514.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-C613A949 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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