

QUALITY REPORT

*Proyecto Mirador enhanced distribution of efficient woodstoves

GS-1574 · GS · Honduras

Report ID: CM-6E489C71 · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, FPIC and grievance mechanisms are documented, and leakage was quantified with a 2% deduction. However, there are several reliability concerns, including multiple document contradictions, a project-specific baseline, and reversal risk that is not clearly resolved in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1574
Sector	industrial
Country	Honduras
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Methodology for Improved Cook-stoves and Kitchen Regimes V.01 V.01
Crediting Period	2016 — 2023
VVB	DNV Climate Change Services AS
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- Several key figures conflict across documents, including leakage treatment, FNRB, usage monitoring method, reversal handling, and crediting period.
- Reversal events are not clearly addressed in the extracted record, and no buffer pool percentage is available.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB, DNV Climate Change Services AS, verified it.

- The baseline is project-specific and last reassessed in 2010, while reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool share is stated.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and states that DNV Climate Change Services AS verified it, which supports the project's core environmental claim. On the other hand, the baseline method is project-specific and was last reassessed in 2010, and reversal events are not clearly addressed in the extracted record. No buffer pool percentage is available, so permanence protection cannot be credited strongly.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period is stated, the VVB is named, and the monitoring report and verification report provide some traceable MRV detail.

- Multiple contradictions reduce trust in the record, and the extracted data do not include claimed versus verified ERR totals.

The monitoring period is stated and the VVB is identified, which helps traceability. Still, the extracted record does not provide claimed versus verified ERR totals, and the monitoring and verification documents disagree on several operational details. That weakens confidence in the public MRV trail even though some core information is present.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ Leakage was quantified with a 2% deduction, which is better than leaving leakage unaddressed.

- The project uses a project baseline rather than a more standardized recent baseline, and the record shows conflicting FNRB and usage-monitoring values across documents.

Leakage was quantified with a 2% deduction, which is a positive sign for over-crediting control. However, the project relies on a project baseline rather than a recent standardized reassessment, and the record contains conflicting values for FNRB, usage monitoring, leakage treatment, reversal handling, and the crediting period. Because the project is marked CORSIA-eligible and CCP status is not mentioned, dual-claim risk is not eliminated.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ The record includes several official document types, with 10 documents used and medium extraction confidence.

- The verification report lists many material findings, and the extracted record does not show a clear, recent, fully consistent documentation set.

The extracted record draws on multiple official documents, including a verification report, a monitoring report, and a PDD, with 10 documents used overall. Medium extraction confidence is acceptable but not ideal, and the verification report lists many material findings. The documentation is therefore usable but not especially clean or complete.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	reversal risk not clearly resolved
● Leakage	2% quantified deduction
● Baseline	project baseline, old reassessment
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not mentioned

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled monitoring package that explains the conflicting FNRB, leakage, usage monitoring, reversal, and crediting-period values.

→ Provide a clear permanence treatment, including reversal management and any buffer pool allocation, plus claimed-versus-verified ERR totals.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_9th monitoring period_01-12-17 to 30-11-18_v3.0.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01-12-11 to 30-11-12_v4.0.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01-05-09 to 30-11-10_v3.0.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01-12-12 to 30-11-13_v3.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-12-10 to 30-11-11_v3.0.pdf
- GS Passport_15-06-10.pdf
- PDD_15-06-10.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1574
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1574
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01-05-09 to 30-11-10_v1.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01-12-11 to 30-11-12_v1.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_4th monitoring period_01-12-12 to 30-11-13_v1.0.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-6E489C71 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy