QUALITY REPORT

GS1729 - Myanmar Stoves Campaign - Soneva in Myanmar - VPA No. 006

GS-1018 · GS · Myanmar

Report ID: CM-0F1BB126 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.3

Overall Score

out of 10

Integrity (35%)	4.2
Transparency (25%)	4.8
Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism, but key crediting assumptions are weakly supported. The biggest concerns are the very large gap between assumed and verified stove usage, leakage treatment that is not clearly justified, and uncertainty created by multiple document contradictions.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1018
Sector	industrial
Country	Myanmar
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	The Gold Standard Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves Version 01.1, February 2013
Crediting Period	2022 — 2027
VVB	Ecolance
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

■ Verified stove usage is far below the assumed 100%, with the extracted record showing 60.4% verified usage.

■ Leakage justification is not addressed in the latest extracted record, despite an earlier document indicating it was quantified.

■ Crediting period and monitoring method differ across documents, which reduces confidence in the consistency of the project record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project used a combined additionality test under the Gold Standard cookstove methodology.

- Leakage treatment is weak: the latest extracted record says leakage is not addressed, and reversal risk is also not addressed.

The project's additionality case is stronger than average because the VVB confirmed it and the record says a combined test was used. However, the latest extracted record says leakage is not addressed, reversal events are not addressed, and no buffer pool percentage is available, which weakens permanence and leakage robustness. The verified stove usage of 60.4% also suggests the project may be materially less effective than assumed in the crediting logic.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period is stated, and the project has a named VVB and a documented monitoring approach based on annual surveys.

- Total verified and claimed emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and several key fields are inconsistent across documents.

The project has a named verifier, a stated monitoring period, and an annual survey monitoring method, which supports basic transparency. That said, the extracted record does not state total verified or claimed emission reductions, and the contradiction set shows differences in leakage treatment, usage monitoring method, and crediting period across documents. These inconsistencies reduce confidence in the completeness and consistency of the public record.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

- The verified usage rate of 60.4% is much lower than the 100% usage assumption, which raises over-crediting risk.

~ The baseline is project-specific and was last reassessed in 2019, but leakage and crediting assumptions remain uncertain.

Claim safety is weakened by the large gap between the assumed 100% usage rate and the verified 60.4% usage rate, which creates a clear over-crediting risk. The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and leakage is not clearly justified in the latest record. The project is not clearly flagged as CCP-approved or CORSIA-eligible, but the main concern is the mismatch between assumptions and observed performance.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ The record includes multiple official documents, a named verifier, and no material findings or corrective actions were reported.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and important fields such as buffer pool treatment and verified emission totals are missing.

Documentation is moderate because the record includes many official project documents, a named VVB, and no material findings or corrective actions. However, extraction confidence is only medium, and several important items are missing, including buffer pool treatment and verified emission totals. The crediting period also appears inconsistent across documents, which lowers confidence in the documentation set.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed test
● **Permanence**	buffer pool and reversal treatment unclear
● **Leakage**	leakage not clearly justified
● **Baseline**	project baseline with reassessment timing known
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and explain why the chosen deduction is appropriate.

→ Publish verified emission totals, buffer pool treatment, and a reconciled document trail resolving the usage-rate and crediting-period contradictions.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01.05.2019 to 30.04.2020_v4.doc
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.05.2018 to 30.04.2019_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.05.2016 to 30.04.2017_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.05.2017 to 30.04.2018_v1.pdf
- GS1729 PoA Design Consulation Report_16.05.2013_round2.pdf
- DEV_809_new.pdf
- Transition Annex_01.05.2016_v2.2.pdf
- DEV_809.pdf
- GS1729 PoA-DD_21.09.2016_v4.docx
- DEV_657.pdf
- PDD_10.24.2017_v4.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1018
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1018
- VR-Myanmar Stove-Microscale-Validation-Appraisal-Report - RCP and PRC.docx
- Myanmar PoA-Design-Change-Memo-1729 31.08.2022(3).docx
- Verification Report_4th monitoring period_01.05.2019 to 30.04.2020.pdf
- Myanmar Stoves Campaign PoA-DD-08.11.2022.pdf
- T-PreReview_V2.0-Stakeholder-Consultation-Report - Myanmar(1).docx
- Validation_Report_GS1729_POA_RCP_DesignChange-R1_.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-0F1BB126 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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