

QUALITY REPORT

GS834 Improved Cooking Stoves for Nigeria Programme of Activities

GS-1215 · GS · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-D32FF7D2 · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.4Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.5
■ Documentation (15%)	3.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a cookstove PoA with some positive evidence on additionality and safeguards, but the record has important reliability gaps. The project shows contradictory monitoring and crediting-period information across documents, no verified leakage deduction, and no clear evidence on permanence management beyond an unaddressed reversal field.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1215
Sector	industrial
Country	Nigeria
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS II.G Version 03
Crediting Period	2011 — 2021
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- The documents conflict on how stove usage was monitored, with the validation report saying self-report while a later appendix says annual survey.
- Crediting period dates differ between documents, and leakage treatment is inconsistent across sources.
- No buffer pool, reversal handling, or verified leakage deduction is stated in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the validation report used a combined additionality test.
- Leakage treatment is not robustly evidenced: one document says it was quantified, but a later appendix says it was not addressed.

The validation report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB verified it, which is a meaningful positive. However, permanence is weakly documented because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is provided. Leakage is also uncertain: the validation report says it was quantified, but a later appendix says it was not addressed, so the evidence is not fully reliable.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The validation report names TÜV NORD CERT GmbH and records a defined monitoring period.
- The extracted record shows contradictions on usage monitoring and crediting period, and verified ER issuance is not stated.

Transparency is only moderate because the VVB is identified as TÜV NORD CERT GmbH and the monitoring period is stated. Still, the extracted record does not include verified emission reductions, and the monitoring approach is contradictory: the validation report says self-report while the appendix says annual survey. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence in the completeness of the documentation trail.

Claim Safety — 4.5 / 10

- + The project uses a recognized CDM methodology, AMS II.G, which supports a standardized accounting framework.
- Claim safety is weakened by missing verified emission reductions, no stated CORSIA eligibility, and inconsistent leakage evidence.

Claim safety is limited by the absence of verified emission reduction totals and by unresolved leakage evidence. The project is under a CDM methodology, which is a positive baseline framework, but the baseline is project-specific rather than recently reassessed or jurisdictional. With no stated CORSIA eligibility and no CCP status, the claim cannot be treated as especially robust.

Documentation — 3.6 / 10

- + The validation report records closed corrective actions, including four CARs and one clarification request.
- Extraction confidence is low and key fields such as buffer pool, reversal events, and verified emissions are not found in the available record.

The documentation set includes a validation report, PDD, and appendix, and the validation report notes that four corrective action requests and one clarification request were closed. Even so, the record is incomplete on several key points, including buffer pool coverage, reversal handling, and verified emissions. The low extraction confidence means at least one key document was poorly readable, which lowers confidence in the documentation score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed test
● Permanence	No buffer or reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Conflicting leakage treatment
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	Registry status not fully stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled monitoring package that resolves the conflicts on stove usage monitoring, leakage treatment, and crediting-period dates.

→ Disclose verified emission reductions, buffer or reversal provisions, and any registry/eligibility status relevant to double-claim risk.

Documents Reviewed

- 501_V1.0_T_Article-6-Authorisation-Checklist_Revised.docx
- LoAA Nigeria_06052024.pdf
- Transition Annex_13.03.2012_v2.1.pdf
- T-PreReview_V1.0-Transition-request-form-CPA2.pdf
- GS Passport_04.12.2012_v1.pdf
- PDD_24.10.2011_v2.3.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1215
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1215
- (1)Validation Report 10.17.2011.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-D32FF7D2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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