

QUALITY REPORT

Clean and Efficient Cooking and Heating Project, China

GS-1271 · GS · China

Report ID: CM-975F3756 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards, but key risk controls are incomplete or unclear. The record also contains contradictions on monitoring and leakage treatment, which lowers confidence in the reported claims. Overall, it looks moderately documented but not especially robust for conservative credit quality purposes.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1271
Sector	industrial
Country	China
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Indicative Programme, Baseline, and Methodology for Improved Cook-Stoves and Kitchen Regimes Version 02
Crediting Period	2009 — 2018
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Monitoring Period	2013 — 2015
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents: one report says leakage was deemed negligible, while a later verification report says it was quantified, but the deduction percentage is not stated.
- Monitoring and crediting-period information conflicts between documents, and the usage monitoring approach changed from annual survey to self-report.
- Reversal risk is not addressed, with no buffer pool percentage found and reversal events marked as not addressed.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which is a meaningful positive signal.
- Leakage treatment is unclear because the later verification report says it was quantified, but no deduction percentage is provided and earlier documentation described it differently.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB validated it, which supports the project's core environmental case. However, the leakage treatment is not cleanly documented: the contradiction log shows an earlier report described leakage as deemed negligible, while the later verification report says it was quantified, but the actual deduction is not stated in the extracted record. Reversal risk is also weakly handled because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is found.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + The project has multiple evidence documents available, including a stakeholder consultation, monitoring report, and verification report, and the VVB is named as TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd.
- Key reporting fields are missing, including verified and claimed emission reductions, and the monitoring approach is inconsistent across documents.

Transparency is mixed. The project has a named verifier, a monitoring period, and multiple source documents, but the extracted record does not provide claimed or verified emission totals, and the usage monitoring method conflicts between annual survey and self-report in the contradiction log. The monitoring and reporting trail is therefore present but not fully consistent or complete.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + The project is on Gold Standard and includes safeguards such as FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing.
- Baseline and leakage details are only partially specified, and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status.

Claim safety is weakened by incomplete baseline and leakage detail. The baseline is project-specific rather than a more standardized or jurisdictional approach, and the record does not provide a leakage deduction percentage even though leakage is described as quantified in the later verification report. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available record.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + The record includes several official documents and a named verifier, with no material findings or corrective actions reported in the verification record.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the crediting-period information conflicts with the monitoring-period timing in the contradiction log.

Documentation is reasonably broad, with a stakeholder consultation, monitoring report, and verification report listed, and the verification report reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. The VVB is identified as TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd, which supports independence. Still, extraction confidence is only medium, and the contradiction log shows conflicting crediting-period and monitoring-method information, which reduces reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	quantified but deduction missing
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment timing limited
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the actual leakage deduction percentage and the calculation basis used in the later verification report.

→ Publish a reconciled monitoring and crediting timeline, including the final usage monitoring method and any explanation for the document discrepancies.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-10-10 to 15-05-12_v8.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01-03-13 to 28-02-15_v7.0.pdf
- GS949 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report (2).pdf
- GS949 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report_Hubei_v3.pdf
- GS949 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report_Guizhou_v3.pdf
- GS949 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1271
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1271
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01-03-09 to 30-09-10_v1.0.pdf
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_16-05-12 to 28-02-13_v3.0.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-975F3756 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy