

QUALITY REPORT

Wastewater Treatment With Biogas System In Palm Oil Mill At Sawi, Chumporn, Thailand

VCS-426 · VCS · Thailand

Report ID: CM-46BAE69A · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
■ Documentation (15%)	7.0

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS biogas wastewater project has VVB-confirmed additionality and a clear monitoring period, but several internal inconsistencies across documents weaken confidence in key claims. Leakage treatment is unclear and the verified ER figure conflicts with earlier documents, increasing over-crediting and communications risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-426
Sector	biogas
Country	Thailand
Vintage	2011, 2012, 2016
Project Methodology	AMS-III.H 13
Crediting Period	2006 — 2016
VVB	KBS Certification Services Private Limited
Verified ERs	104,426 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Verified emission reductions are inconsistent across documents (104,426 vs 91,121), creating over-crediting and reporting risk.
- Leakage is treated inconsistently (earlier “negligible” vs later “not addressed”), with no quantified leakage deduction found.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2018).

- Leakage is not consistently treated and no leakage deduction is evidenced (validation report, 2012 vs monitoring report, 2018).

The monitoring report (2018) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, supporting the project's additionality case. However, leakage handling is weak: the validation report (2012) deems leakage negligible while the monitoring report (2018) indicates leakage was not addressed, and no leakage deduction percentage is evidenced in the extracted record. Corrective actions and a deviation due to lack of monitoring for a parameter (monitoring report, 2018) also reduce confidence in operational controls relevant to robust quantification.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-06-01 to 2016-05-31) and the VVB is identified as KBS Certification Services (monitoring report, 2018).

- Multiple cross-document inconsistencies (safeguards, FPIC, ER totals, crediting period) reduce MRV clarity and comparability.

Key MRV elements are available, including the monitoring period (2012-06-01 to 2016-05-31) and the VVB name (monitoring report, 2018). Transparency is reduced by inconsistencies across documents on safeguards/FPIC/grievance and by conflicting ER totals and crediting-period dates, which makes it harder for third parties to reconcile what was implemented and credited. The record does not provide a clear leakage deduction value or usage monitoring method, leaving gaps in how key parameters were tracked.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- ER totals conflict across documents (validation report, 2012 vs later record showing 104,426), increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, limiting safe downstream claims.

Over-crediting/communications risk is elevated because the verified ER figure differs across documents (an earlier validation report in 2012 shows 91,121 while a later record shows 104,426). Leakage is also not consistently justified (negligible vs not addressed), which can undermine defensibility of climate claims for an avoidance biogas project. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, so the project should not be marketed as meeting those labels without independent confirmation.

Documentation — 7.0 / 10

+ A relatively strong document set is present (10 documents; monitoring report, validation report, PDD) with high extraction confidence.

- Corrective actions were required, including a deviation due to lack of monitoring for a parameter, indicating documentation/control weaknesses (monitoring report, 2018).

The extracted record draws on a reasonably broad evidence base (10 documents including monitoring report, validation report, and PDD) and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting document reliability overall. Still, the monitoring report (2018) lists corrective actions (including correction of reported data and a deviation due to lack of monitoring), which signals that documentation and data management were not fully audit-ready at draft stage. Contradictory statements across monitoring/validation documents on safeguards and crediting period further weaken documentary coherence.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not consistently justified; no deduction evidenced
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing limited
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent across years
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not found in record

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear, consistent leakage assessment (including whether leakage is negligible and any quantified deduction) aligned across validation and monitoring documents.

→ Reconcile and publicly explain the ER total discrepancy and the crediting-period date inconsistency with a single authoritative registry-linked statement and updated monitoring/verification documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Registration Review Report
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report

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-46BAE69A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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