

## QUALITY REPORT

# Solar Cookstoves Project in Bolivia

GS-1206 · GS · Bolivia, Plurinational State of

Report ID: CM-2B3E7EDF · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.0**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.1</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.8</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.2</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>4.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a cookstove project with some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings in the monitoring report. However, several key safeguards and accounting details are missing or only partially documented, and there are contradictions on leakage treatment and the FNRB assumption that reduce confidence in the claimed climate benefit.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1206
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Bolivia, Plurinational State of
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Indicative Programme, Baseline, and Monitoring Methodology for Improved Cook-Stoves and Kitchen Regimes V02
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
VVB	GoodPlanet
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, with one record saying it was deemed negligible and another saying it was not addressed.
- The FNRB method and value changed across documents, which creates uncertainty about the baseline and over-crediting risk.
- No buffer pool, reversal detail, or verified usage rate is stated in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.1 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the monitoring report reports no material findings or corrective actions.
- Baseline and leakage accounting are less robust because the project uses a project baseline, leakage justification is contradicted, and reversal risk is not addressed.

The monitoring report dated 2019-06-19 states that additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and it reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. On the weaker side, the project uses a project baseline and the extracted record does not show a buffer pool or any quantified reversal treatment, while reversal events are marked as not addressed. Leakage is also less secure because the record contains a contradiction between a later statement that leakage was deemed negligible and an earlier statement that it was not addressed.

### Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period, VVB name, methodology version, and monitoring approach are stated in the monitoring report.
- Total verified versus claimed emission reductions are not available in the extracted record, and key public-facing details such as grievance mechanism and FPIC are not stated.

The monitoring report provides some core MRV information, including the monitoring period from 2016-01-01 to 2018-09-10, the VVB name, the methodology version, and an annual survey for usage monitoring. Transparency is limited because total claimed and verified emission reductions are not available in the extracted record, and several safeguard-related items such as grievance mechanism and FPIC are not stated. The medium extraction confidence also suggests at least one key source was not fully readable.

### Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- + The project uses a recognized Gold Standard methodology and the VVB confirmed additionality.
- The baseline relies on a project-specific approach, and contradictions in FNRB method and value raise over-crediting concerns.

Claim safety is moderate because the project is under Gold Standard and additionality was VVB-confirmed, which supports credibility. However, the baseline is project-specific rather than a more conservative standardized approach, and the contradictions on FNRB method and value are material: the later monitoring record uses a national default of 80.49, while an earlier document used a local field value of 61. That shift could affect the baseline emissions estimate and increases over-crediting risk.

### Documentation — 4.1 / 10

- + Seven documents were used and the monitoring report is dated 2019, which is reasonably recent relative to the 2011–2021 crediting period.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and several important fields are not stated in the available documents, including buffer pool, grievance mechanism, and verified usage rate.

Documentation quality is mixed. Seven documents were used, and the monitoring report is relatively recent within the crediting period, but the extracted record still lacks several important items, including buffer pool percentage, grievance mechanism, FPIC, and verified usage rate. Because extraction confidence is medium rather than high, the documentation score is held down even though the monitoring report itself appears reasonably complete on the items it does report.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal treatment stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage deemed negligible but inconsistent
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline with reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards mentioned but not fully documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete reconciliation of the leakage and FNRB contradictions, with the governing document hierarchy explained and the final values clearly justified.

→ Publish the missing MRV and safeguards details, including verified emission reductions, buffer or reversal treatment, grievance mechanism, FPIC, and usage-rate evidence.

## Documents Reviewed

- (2)Monitoring Report\_5th monitoring period\_01.01.16 to 10.09.18\_v2.pdf
- (2)Monitoring Report\_4th monitoring period\_01.01.14 to 31.12.15\_v2.pdf
- (2)Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_11.08.09 to 10.08.11\_v3.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report\_2nd monitoring period\_11.08.11 to 31.12.12\_v2.pdf
- (2)Monitoring Report\_3rd monitoring period\_01.01.13 to 31.12.13\_v2.docx
- GS Passport\_04.27.2011\_v2.2.pdf
- PDD\_14.06.11\_v3.pdf
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1206
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1206

### 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-2B3E7EDF · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)