

QUALITY REPORT

Integrated Biomass Energy Conservation Project - Malawi

GS-1078 · GS · Malawi

Report ID: CM-326C69BB · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.9
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.7
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a stated barrier test, and no reported material findings. However, the record also shows a project-specific baseline, a reversal risk that is not addressed, and contradictions around leakage, usage monitoring, and benefit sharing that reduce confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1078
Sector	industrial
Country	Malawi
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralised Thermal Energy Consumption 01
Crediting Period	2008 — 2018
VVB	TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, with one verification report using a 5% deduction while an earlier verification report treated leakage as negligible.
- Usage monitoring and benefit-sharing evidence conflict between documents, and reversal risk is not addressed despite no buffer pool information being found.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the validation report supports a barrier-based additionality case.
- The project uses a project-specific baseline last reassessed in 2008, and reversal events are not addressed with no buffer pool information found.

The verification report confirms additionality through a barrier test and states that the VVB reviewed the project, which supports the core crediting case. At the same time, the baseline is project-specific and was last reassessed in 2008, while reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage was found, which weakens permanence confidence. Leakage is treated as quantified in the 2015 verification report, but the earlier verification report described it as negligible, so the integrity score is moderated for inconsistency.

Transparency — 4.9 / 10

- + The record includes multiple official documents, a named VVB, and a defined monitoring period from 2012-10-02 to 2013-10-01.
- Claimed versus verified ER figures are not available, and the monitoring method is disputed between an annual survey and self-reporting.

The documentation set includes a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and several official project documents, which helps traceability. However, the record does not provide verified versus claimed emission reduction totals, and the usage monitoring approach is inconsistent between an annual survey in the verification report and self-reporting in the monitoring report. The absence of clear registry completeness details and the medium extraction confidence keep transparency below average.

Claim Safety — 4.7 / 10

- + Leakage was quantified at 5% in the verification report, which is better than an unqualified zero deduction.
- The project-specific baseline and conflicting leakage treatment across reports increase over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the project-specific baseline and by conflicting leakage treatment across reports, because these issues can affect the risk of over-crediting. The verification report's 5% leakage deduction is a positive sign, but the earlier report's negligible-leakage treatment creates uncertainty about which assumption should be trusted. No CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval is stated, so there is no strong external claim-quality signal to offset these concerns.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Fifteen documents were used, including validation, verification, PDD, and monitoring materials, with medium extraction confidence.
- One key document was not clearly readable, and some core fields such as buffer pool coverage and reversal detail were not found in the extracted record.

Documentation breadth is reasonably good, with validation, verification, PDD, and monitoring documents all represented and fifteen documents used overall. Still, the extraction confidence is only medium, and at least one key document was poorly readable, which lowers confidence in completeness. Important items such as buffer pool coverage, reversal detail, and verified emission totals were not found in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	No buffer pool or reversal detail found
● Leakage	Quantified but inconsistent leakage treatment
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing old
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing noted
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of the leakage, usage monitoring, and benefit-sharing discrepancies across the validation, monitoring, and verification documents.

→ Provide explicit permanence and claim-safety evidence, including buffer pool treatment, reversal monitoring, and verified emission reduction totals.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_10.02.2010 to 10.01.2011_v4.pdf
- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_02.10.2012 to 01.10.2013_v5.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_24.11.2008 to 10.01.2010.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_10.02.2011 to 10.01.2012_v5.pdf
- GS Passport_01-07-09.pdf
- PDD 19.11.2010_v3.pdf
- PDD 02.11.2012_v6.pdf
- PDD 30.11.2009_v2.pdf
- PDD 02.11.2012_v6.doc
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1078
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1078
- GS Validation Report 08.05.2010_v2.1.pdf
- Verification Report_4th monitoring period_10.02.2012 to 10.01.2013.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_10.02.2010 to 10.01.2011_v1.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_10.02.2011 to 10.01.2012.pdf
- GS Verification Workplan 28.01.2013.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_24.11.2008 to 10.01.2010.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-326C69BB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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