

QUALITY REPORT

Federal Intertrade Haiyuan Solar Cooker Project

GS-1155 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-2C7AF9AF · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
■ Documentation (15%)	4.3

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no unresolved material findings, but key risk controls are weak or missing in the extracted record. Transparency is limited by missing verification totals, no stated buffer pool, and contradictory documentation on usage monitoring and the crediting period.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1155
Sector	cookstoves
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.C. Version 3.0
Crediting Period	2010 — 2020
VVB	TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, even though a 0% deduction is reported.
- The documents conflict on the usage monitoring method and the crediting period, which reduces reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd using an investment test, and the verification process reported no unresolved material findings.

- Leakage treatment is weak: the record says leakage was not addressed, even though a 0% deduction was applied, and reversal risk is not discussed.

The verification report evidence is moderately strong because additionality was confirmed by TÜV Rheinland (China) Ltd using an investment test, and the verification process noted one corrective action request and one clarification request that were satisfactorily resolved. However, the baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized baseline, leakage is marked as not addressed despite a 0% deduction, and reversal risk is not discussed in the extracted record. The absence of a buffer pool figure also limits confidence in permanence controls.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2012-09-01 to 2013-08-31, and the project has an identified VVB.

- Key reporting figures are missing, including verified and claimed emission reductions, and the extracted record shows conflicting descriptions of how usage was monitored.

The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the project has an identified verifier, which helps traceability. That said, the extracted record does not provide claimed or verified emission reduction totals, the FNRB is not applicable, and the usage monitoring method is inconsistent across documents. The lack of a buffer pool figure and missing registry completeness details further reduce transparency.

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline under AMS-I.C., and additionality was independently verified.

- Claim safety is weakened by the absence of verified emission totals, no stated FNRB value, and no clear CORSIA or CCP status.

Claim safety is only moderate because the project has a verified additionality test and a defined methodology, but the baseline remains project-specific and leakage is not substantively justified. There is no verified usage rate, no FNRB value to compare against national defaults, and no clear CORSIA or CCP status in the record. These gaps make over-crediting risk harder to rule out.

Documentation — 4.3 / 10

+ The record includes multiple official-document elements such as the VVB name, monitoring period, safeguards, and a list of resolved findings.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, the evidence-doc list is effectively incomplete, and there are contradictions on both usage monitoring and the crediting period.

Documentation quality is limited by medium extraction confidence and an evidence set that appears incomplete in the extracted record. The project does include several useful elements, such as the VVB name, monitoring period, safeguards, and resolved findings, but key fields remain missing or unstated. The contradictions on usage monitoring and the crediting period indicate that the source documents are not fully aligned.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
● Permanence	No buffer pool stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified and claimed emission reduction totals, along with the underlying calculation sheets and registry entries.

→ Clarify the usage monitoring method and provide a documented leakage and permanence assessment, including any buffer pool treatment.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-09-12 to 31-08-13_v3.0.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_15-09-10 to 31-08-12_v3.1.pdf
- GS Passport_10-05-13.pdf
- PDD_08-12-12.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1155
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1155
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_15-09-10 to 31-08-12_v1.2.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-09-12 to 31-08-13_v1.2.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-2C7AF9AF · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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