QUALITY REPORT

CPA # 1 Improved Cooking Stoves for Nigeria, GS 1162

GS-102 · GS · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-2D37A5BD · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	4.4
	Transparency (25%)	4.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.9
	Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism. However, the evidence also shows major uncertainty around leakage treatment, no buffer pool or reversal handling found, and a large gap between claimed and verified emission reductions, which weakens confidence in the crediting claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-102
Sector	industrial
Country	Nigeria
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS II G version 03
Crediting Period	2011 — 2018
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Verified ERs	26,905 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- The verified emission reductions are far below the amount claimed, suggesting a substantial over-claim risk.
- Leakage is not addressed in the older verification record, and no leakage deduction is stated in the extracted facts.
- No buffer pool, reversal treatment, or reversal history is documented in the available record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which supports the project case.

- Leakage treatment is not addressed in the verification record, and no buffer pool or reversal protection is stated.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and notes that the clarification and corrective action requests were closed. That said, the record does not state any buffer pool, does not address reversal events, and gives no quantified leakage deduction, which weakens permanence and baseline robustness. The baseline is project-based rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed approach, so the overall integrity case is only moderate.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period, VVB name, and registry information are stated, and the project has multiple document types in the evidence set.

- The verified emissions are much lower than the claimed amount, and the extracted record does not provide a clear public trail for how the discrepancy was resolved.

Transparency is limited by missing or incomplete MRV details in the extracted record. The monitoring period, VVB name, and registry are available, but the record does not provide a clear leakage deduction, buffer pool treatment, or a complete explanation for the large difference between claimed and verified emission reductions. The medium extraction confidence also means at least one key document was not fully readable, which further reduces confidence in the documentation trail.

Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

- The verified emission reductions of 26,905 are far below the 66,368 claimed in the record, which raises over-crediting concerns.

~ CORSIA eligibility is stated, but CCP status is not found in the available documents, leaving dual-claim risk only partly resolved.

Claim safety is weakened by the large gap between the claimed emission reductions of 66,368 and the verified amount of 26,905 in the verification report. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not found, so dual-channel claim risk is not fully resolved from the available documents. Leakage is also a concern because one contradiction points to a later monitoring report with quantified leakage, while the older verification record says leakage was not addressed; I privileged the later monitoring report for leakage treatment, but the inconsistency still lowers confidence.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ The evidence set includes a PDD, verification report, stakeholder consultation material, and monitoring report, with 12 documents used overall.

~ Extraction confidence is only medium, and several key items such as buffer pool, baseline reassessment, and leakage quantification are not found in the available documents.

The documentation set is reasonably broad, with a PDD, verification report, stakeholder consultation material, and monitoring report all present, and 12 documents were used. The verification report also shows multiple clarification and corrective action requests that were closed, which is a positive sign for process completeness. However, medium extraction confidence, missing values for several key fields, and no stated buffer pool or baseline reassessment reduce the documentation score.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
Permanence	No buffer or reversal treatment stated
Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent or missing
Baseline	Project baseline with no reassessment stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear reconciliation between claimed and verified emission reductions, with the underlying calculation sheets and any issuance adjustments.

→ Document quantified leakage treatment, reversal protection or buffer allocation, and any baseline reassessment in the monitoring and verification record.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01.07.2014 to 30.06.2015_v2.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013_v7.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_10.11.2011 to 30.06.2012_v3.pdf
- Monitoring Report_8th monitoring period_01.07.2019 to 40.06.2020_v5.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.07.2013 to 30.06.2014_v3.pdf
- GS1162 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report.pdf
- GS Passport 07.11.2012_v2.5.doc
- (2)PDD 24.10.2011_v2.1.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-102
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-102
- Verification Report_7th monitoring period_01.07.2018 to 30.06.2019_v5.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_10.11.2011 to 30.06.2012_v6.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01.07.2012 to 30.06.2013_v3.pdf
- Verification Report_4th monitoring period_01.07.2014 to 30.06.2015_v2.1.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-2D37A5BD · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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