

QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Energy Savings Lamps in Madagascar - Project 1

GS-159 · GS · Madagascar

Report ID: CM-0C49ED87 · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
■ Transparency (25%)	5.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a standard Gold Standard energy-efficiency project with some positive safeguards and a VVB verification, but the record has important gaps around leakage, reversal handling, and quantified issuance data. The documentation is usable, yet several key values are missing or inconsistent, which limits confidence in the crediting claim.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-159
Sector	industrial
Country	Madagascar
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-II.J Version 04
Crediting Period	2015 — 2024
VVB	SustainCERT
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the verification report, despite an earlier monitoring report indicating a quantified treatment.
- The project documents conflict on the crediting period and on whether reversal-related handling was reported, which raises reliability concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality uses a combined test and the project was verified by SustainCERT, which supports some robustness.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed in the verification report, and reversal handling is not clearly resolved despite CFL collection and recycling being described.

The verification report from SustainCERT confirms a combined additionality test, which is a positive sign, but it does not clearly confirm additionality in a way that fully closes the risk. Leakage is a major weakness: the verification report says it is not addressed, while the older monitoring report had a quantified treatment, so I privilege the later verification report as the more authoritative source for current project quality. The project also describes CFL collection and recycling, but reversal events are still not clearly resolved in the extracted record.

Transparency — 5.2 / 10

- + The monitoring period, VVB name, methodology version, and registry are stated, giving a basic audit trail.
- Total claimed and verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is only medium.

The record identifies the Gold Standard registry, the monitoring period, the methodology version, and the VVB, which supports basic traceability. However, the extracted facts do not include total claimed or verified emission reductions, and the minimum extraction confidence is only medium, so the documentation trail is incomplete. The annual survey method is stated, but the absence of quantified issuance figures limits transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project is an energy-efficiency domestic project under Gold Standard, with FPIC conducted and a grievance mechanism present.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is weakened by the project-specific baseline and the inconsistent treatment of leakage across documents. FPIC was conducted and a grievance mechanism is present, which helps reduce social-risk concerns, but the project still lacks a clear, consistently documented leakage justification. Because CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, I cannot treat dual-claim risk as excluded.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + Three core document types were used, including the PDD, monitoring report, and verification report.
- The verification report required corrective actions and a forward action request, and the record contains several unresolved gaps and contradictions.

The evidence base includes the PDD, monitoring report, and verification report, which is a reasonable document set. Still, the verification report issued a forward action request and corrective actions, including better household identification and closer monitoring of CFL collection and recycling, showing that the documentation was not fully clean. The crediting period also conflicts with the PDD, and the later verification report is the more specific and recent source, so I privilege it for scoring while discounting confidence due to the inconsistency.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Combined test present, VVB confirmation unclear
● Permanence	No clear reversal event resolution
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment and reconcile it across the monitoring and verification reports.

→ Publish verified issuance figures and resolve the crediting-period and reversal-handling inconsistencies in a single updated audit trail.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.01.2017 to 31.12.2017_v2.pdf
- 220826_GS1334_ERs_calculation_2019_Round I (2) (1).xlsx
- (1)Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018_v1.doc
- GS1334 MR2019_Final (1).docx
- (1)Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.01.2016 to 31.12.2016_v1.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.01.2015 to 31.12.2015_v2.pdf
- PDD_28-01-14.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-159
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-159
- 20210730.MD.GEN.009_Verification_Report_GS1334_VER05.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-0C49ED87 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

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