QUALITY REPORT

Efficient and Clean Cooking for Mozambican Low-Income Households

GS-1084 · Gold Standard · Mozambique

Report ID: CM-3C381782 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	5.6
	Transparency (25%)	5.1
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.8
	Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a Gold Standard cookstove project with VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified 5% leakage deduction, and safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, the record shows many corrective actions, no buffer pool information, reversal risk not addressed, and several contradictions across documents, which reduce confidence in the claimed emission reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1084
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Mozambique
Vintage	2020
Project Methodology	AMS-II.G 10.0
Crediting Period	2017 — 2024
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A.
Verified ERs	23,834 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2023
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- The verification report lists many corrective actions and material findings, indicating significant documentation or implementation issues.
- Key figures conflict across documents, including usage rates and the crediting period, and the extraction confidence is low.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

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

- The verification report records numerous corrective actions and material findings, and reversal risk is not addressed; no buffer pool percentage was found.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and names LGAI Technological Center, S.A. as the VVB, which is a positive sign. It also reports a quantified leakage deduction of 5% and no reversal events, but reversal risk is still not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is available. The large number of corrective actions and material findings in the verification report weaken confidence in the robustness of the project controls.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period, VVB name, and monitoring approach are stated, and the project reports a quantified 5% leakage deduction.

- The extracted record has low extraction confidence, and total claimed emissions are not found in the available documents, limiting traceability.

The record includes a monitoring period from 2020-04-30 to 2023-03-31, the VVB name, and an annual survey usage-monitoring method, which supports basic MRV visibility. However, total claimed emissions are not found in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is low, meaning at least one key source was difficult to read. That combination reduces transparency because the evidence trail is incomplete and less reliable.

Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

+ The project is an avoidance activity with a quantified leakage deduction and a verified usage rate of 90% in the monitoring report.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized or recently reassessed, and the usage-rate figures conflict across documents.

This is a cookstove avoidance project with a verified usage rate of 90% in the monitoring report and a quantified 5% leakage deduction, both of which help reduce over-crediting risk. Still, the baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed baseline, and the usage-rate assumption conflicts with earlier documents. CORSIA eligibility is stated as true, while CCP status is not mentioned, so dual-channel claim risk is not fully resolved.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including validation, monitoring, and verification reports, and safeguards are explicitly mentioned.

- The verification report shows many corrective actions, the extraction confidence is low, and the crediting period conflicts with the PDD.

The evidence set spans validation, monitoring, and verification reports, and the project documents FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and other safeguards. Even so, the verification report lists many corrective actions, and the extraction confidence is low, which suggests the documentation package is not cleanly complete. The crediting period in the verification report also conflicts with the PDD, indicating that the documentary record is not fully consistent.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
Leakage	5% quantified deduction
Baseline	project baseline, reassessment missing
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of the conflicting usage-rate, benefit-sharing, and crediting-period figures across the PDD, monitoring report, and verification report.

→ Provide explicit reversal-risk treatment, including buffer pool details or a formal statement explaining why permanence risk is not material for this project.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_14.02.2017 to 31.12.2017_v9.pdf
- GS6155 Ex Post ER Calculations MP3 2023_PR_Round 3_PUBLIC.xlsx
- GS6155 ER calculations_PUBLIC.xlsx
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form_GS6155_SC_FINAL.pdf
- GS6155 ER calculations.xlsx
- GS6155 Monitoring-Report ver 06 R2 Answers_Track_Changes_to_be_Reviewed by SC.docx
- GS6155 Ex Post ER Calculations MP3 2023_PR_Round 3_.xlsx
- GS_6155_Monitoring Report MP3 2023_PR Round 3 - Clean.pdf
- 042021_PoA DD_Round III.docx
- PDD_04-04-2019.docx
- 042021_PDD_form13_VPA(ver08.1)_Round III.docx
- 180918_PDD_form13_VPA(ver08.1)_Clean mode.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1084
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1084
- FVR verification_GS_6155_ver 06 Clean.pdf
- Verification Report _VPA 6155 TR1 - Clean(3).pdf
- Validation Report_05-04-2019.pdf
- CPA-FVR - Clean mode - April.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_14.02.2017 to 31.12.2017_v5.1.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-3C381782 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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