

QUALITY REPORT

GS 1220 Ecological Stoves for Better Living - Micro Scale PoA - VPA1 Bolivia

GS-133 · GS · Bolivia, Plurinational State of

Report ID: CM-D10721A2 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This is a Gold Standard household energy-efficiency project with some strong safeguards and a documented additionality approach, but the evidence base is uneven. The biggest concern is inconsistent usage-rate evidence across documents, which creates uncertainty about emission reductions and claim accuracy.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-133
Sector	industrial
Country	Bolivia, Plurinational State of
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption version 1
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	null
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Usage-rate evidence conflicts between the verification report and the monitoring report, with 0.9 in the older verification report versus 0.75 in the later monitoring report.
- Reversal risk is not clearly addressed and no buffer pool share is stated, which weakens permanence confidence even for a stove project.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ The project uses a combined additionality test, which is stronger than a single weak test, and no material findings were reported in the verification record.

- Leakage is only described as quantified with a 0% deduction, while reversal events are noted as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is available.

The project appears to have a documented combined additionality test, and the verification record reports no material findings or corrective actions. However, permanence is weaker because reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is provided, even though this is a stove project rather than a removal project. Leakage is treated with a 0% deduction and a quantified justification, but the overall robustness is reduced by the limited permanence evidence.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The monitoring report and verification report both provide usage-rate information and a defined monitoring period, which helps traceability.

- The VVB name is not stated in the extracted record, and the key usage-rate and usage-monitoring-method values conflict across documents.

The monitoring period is clearly stated, and both the verification and monitoring records provide usage-rate information, which supports traceability. That said, the VVB name is not found in the extracted record, which limits auditability. Transparency is also weakened by the conflicting usage-rate and monitoring-method values across documents, suggesting the public record is not fully consistent.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project applies a project-specific baseline and includes a quantified leakage treatment, which is better than an unbounded baseline claim.

- The conflicting usage-rate figures between the 2018 verification report and the 2021 monitoring report raise over-crediting risk, and CORSIA eligibility is not stated.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a project-specific baseline and reports a quantified leakage treatment. The main risk is the contradiction on usage rates: the older verification report shows 0.9, while the later monitoring report shows 0.75, and the same later report is also the source for the assumed usage rate of 0.75. I privileged the later monitoring report for operational parameters because it is more recent and likely reflects current performance, but the discrepancy still lowers confidence in the claimed reductions. CORSIA eligibility is not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

+ Five documents were used, including a PDD, monitoring report, and verification report, and extraction confidence is high.

- The record does not state the VVB name, and the crediting period is much longer than the monitoring period shown, leaving recency and completeness gaps.

Documentation is reasonably broad, with five documents used and high extraction confidence overall. The presence of FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing language is positive for completeness. Still, the VVB name is missing, and the long crediting period relative to the monitoring period leaves a gap in how current the evidence is for the claimed issuance window.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Combined test present, not VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	No buffer pool stated; reversals not addressed
● Leakage	Quantified 0% leakage deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA eligibility not stated; CCP not mentioned

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled monitoring note explaining the usage-rate change from 0.9 to 0.75 and the shift from telephone survey to annual survey, with a clear rationale for which value governs issuance.

→ Add explicit permanence and market-claim documentation, including buffer pool treatment or reversal handling and a clear statement on CORSIA eligibility and any CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_04-04-2018 to 30-11-2019_v3.1.pdf
- (3)Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.01.2017 to 31.12.2018_v1.pdf
- (3)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016_v2.docx
- GS1221_Project-Annual-Report-Form 2022_v1.pdf
- GS1221_Project-Annual-Report-Form 2021_v1.pdf
- (3)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_17.08.2014 to 31.12.2016_v2.docx
- PDD 13.10.2018.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-133
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-133
- Verification Report_4th monitoring period_04-04-2018 to 31-12-2019.pdf
- GS4GG_1221_MR5_CEDSOL_V1.1_24May2021.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-D10721A2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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