

QUALITY REPORT

Efficient Cookstoves in Bahia III

GS-1059 · GS · Brazil

Report ID: CM-31200BA3 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
■ Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a cookstove project with some positive MRV signals, including a verified usage rate of 98% and no material findings in the monitoring report. However, key integrity items are weakly documented: leakage is not addressed, reversal risk is not discussed, and the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized or recently reassessed in a way that reduces uncertainty.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1059
Sector	industrial
Country	Brazil
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Gold Standard Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves v. 01
Crediting Period	2019-01-01 — null
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	4 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is not addressed in the monitoring report, which is a notable gap for a household energy project.
- The crediting period is inconsistent between the monitoring report and the PDD, which reduces confidence in the documentation trail.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

- + The monitoring report confirms additionality was verified by the VVB, and no material findings were reported.
- Leakage is not addressed, and reversal risk is not discussed; the project uses a project-specific baseline.

The monitoring report states that additionality was verified by the VVB, and it reports no material findings or corrective actions required. On the weaker side, the project uses a project baseline, leakage is marked as not addressed, and reversal events are not addressed, which limits confidence in long-term environmental integrity.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

- + The monitoring report provides a defined monitoring period and a quantified verified usage rate of 98% based on annual surveys.
- Total ER claims and verifications are not stated, and the VVB name is not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring report gives a clear 2019 monitoring period and a verified usage rate of 98% derived from annual surveys. However, total ER claims and verifications are not stated in the extracted record, and the VVB name is not found, which limits public traceability.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

- + The verified usage rate of 98% is strong, and the FNRB value of 0.81 is explicitly stated using a national default method.
- Leakage justification is listed as not addressed, and the project is not shown to be CCP-approved or clearly outside CORSIA eligibility.

Claim safety is helped by the high verified usage rate and the explicitly stated FNRB value of 0.81 using a national default method. That said, leakage is not addressed, and the record does not show CCP approval or a clear CORSIA status, so over-crediting and dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out cleanly.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

- + Two core documents were used, and the monitoring report is recent relative to the 2019 monitoring period.
- The extraction confidence is high, but the crediting period is contradictory across documents and several safeguard details are not fully specified.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong: only two documents were used, and the monitoring report is dated 2020-06-01 for the 2019 monitoring period. The extraction confidence is high, but several fields remain unspecified, including the VVB name, buffer pool, and leakage treatment, and the crediting period is inconsistent across documents.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing limited
● Safeguards	Partial safeguards documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not clearly stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Publish a clear leakage assessment and, if applicable, a quantified leakage deduction with justification.
- Resolve the crediting-period discrepancy and disclose the VVB name, registry status, and any CORSIA or CCP eligibility information.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019_v4.pdf
- PDD_19.03.2018_v4.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1059
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1059

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-31200BA3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy