

QUALITY REPORT

GS1729 Myanmar Stoves Campaign - Soneva in Myanmar - VPA No. 009

GS-1487 · GS · Myanmar

Report ID: CM-48439296 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.7Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	3.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.0
■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows some procedural strengths (additionality confirmed by a VVB, FPIC and grievance mechanism documented) but has notable data reliability and documentation gaps. Contradictory monitoring figures, low extraction confidence, an older baseline reassessment (2018) and unaddressed reversal risk reduce confidence in robustness and crediting safety.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1487
Sector	industrial
Country	Myanmar
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	The Gold Standard Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves Version 01.1, February 2013
Crediting Period	2022 — 2027
VVB	Ecolance
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	23 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Contradictory verified usage rates (52.63% vs 92.3%) implying possible over-crediting
- Min extraction confidence is low and evidence documents are not clearly identified

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality confirmed by the VVB (verification report; VVB: Ecolance)

- Reversal risk not addressed and buffer pool percentage not stated, baseline last reassessed in 2018 (monitoring/PDD documents)

The verification report confirms additionality using a combined test and names Ecolance as the VVB, which supports the project's additionality claim. The project uses a project-specific baseline (Gold Standard cookstoves methodology) with the last reassessment dated 2018, which is somewhat dated. Leakage is treated (quantified justification and a leakage deduction reported), but reversal risk is flagged as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is provided in the extracted record. These issues lower confidence in permanence and baseline robustness.

Transparency — 3.6 / 10

+ VVB named (Ecolance) and monitoring period provided (2022-01-01 — 2023-06-30)

- Key ERR figures and total ERR claimed/verified are not in the extracted record and evidence docs are listed as unknown; extraction confidence is low

A named VVB (Ecolance), monitoring period (2022-01-01 to 2023-06-30), and methodology/version are present in the extracted data, which helps transparency. However, total ERR claimed and total ERR verified are not found in the extracted record, evidence documents are listed as unknown, and the minimum extraction confidence is low — all of which reduce traceability and public verification of claims.

Claim Safety — 3.0 / 10

+ Leakage was quantified with a leakage deduction reported (0.95) and a quantified justification

- Large contradictions in monitored usage rates (52.63% vs 92.3%) increase over-crediting risk; CORSIA/CCP status not stated

Leakage appears to be quantified and a leakage deduction is reported, which is positive. However, there are substantial contradictions in verified usage rates (52.63% in a 2024-dated source versus 92.3% in a 2017 source), creating a material over-crediting risk. CORSIA and CCP eligibility are not stated, leaving double-claim risk unclear.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ A named VVB and 20 documents were used for extraction; methodology and version cited (Gold Standard Simplified Methodology, Feb 2013)

- Min extraction confidence is low, evidence docs are not clearly identified, and some fields (total ERR claimed/verified, buffer pool) are missing

The extraction used 20 documents and cites the methodology and a VVB, and safeguards (FPIC, grievance mechanism) are documented. Nevertheless, the evidence_docs field is 'unknown', min_extraction_confidence is low, and some critical fields (ERR totals, buffer pool percent) are missing. No material findings or corrective actions are listed in the extracted record, but the low extraction confidence suggests caution.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	reversal risk unaddressed
● Leakage	quantified deduction
● Baseline	project baseline; reassessed 2018
● Safeguards	FPIC & grievance present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish clear evidence documents (verification/monitoring reports) with ERR totals and a clear list of evidence sources to raise extraction confidence

→ Resolve contradictions by confirming the verified usage monitoring method and final verified usage rate in a recent VVB report, and disclose buffer pool/reversal treatment

Documents Reviewed

- (1)VPA 009 (GS 6599) - (Third Term) - GS4GG Monitoring Report.V3.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.02.2019 to 31.01.2020_v2.pdf
- VPA 009-Project-Annual-Report-Form(2).pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.02.2018 to 31.01.2019_v2.pdf
- VPA 009 (GS6599) - Ex Post Emission Reductions Sheet (Fourth Term).xlsx
- VPA 009-Project-Annual-Report-Form(1).pdf
- VPA 009 (GS 6599)-(Fourth Term) V4-Monitoring-Report -clean.pdf
- PDD_11.27.2018_v5.pdf
- GS1729 PoA-DD_21.09.2016_v4.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1487
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1487
- Myanmar Stoves Campaign PoA-DD-08.11.2022.pdf
- Myanmar PoA-Design-Change-Memo-1729 31.08.2022(3).docx
- DEV_657.pdf
- DEV_809_new.pdf
- DEV_809.pdf
- GS1729 PoA Design Consultation Report_16.05.2013_round2.pdf
- VR-Myanmar Stove-Microscale-Validation-Appraisal-Report - RCP and PRC.docx
- T-PreReview_V2.0-Stakeholder-Consultation-Report - Myanmar(1).docx
- CCIPL1733_FVR_29022024-track 03042024 - CL(2).pdf
- Validation_Report_GS1729_POA_RCP_DesignChange-R1_.pdf
- T-V5.0 GS 6599-Deviation-Request-Form.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-48439296 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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