QUALITY REPORT

Biomass Briquette Based Earth Stove Project

GS-1700 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-8157A1D8 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.4
	Transparency (25%)	5.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
	Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and no material findings reported in the monitoring report. However, permanence and baseline robustness are only partially documented, and the record contains contradictions on leakage treatment and the crediting period that reduce confidence. Transparency is moderate because the monitoring report is available, but key verification details such as the VVB name and verified error reduction figures are not stated in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1700
Sector	biomass
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Project Category: I.C. – Thermal energy for the user with or without electricity version 18
Crediting Period	2009 — 2016
Monitoring Period	2009 — 2012
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- ■ The monitoring report and PDD disagree on leakage treatment, with the later report using a 10% deduction while the PDD described leakage as negligible or zero.
- ■ The crediting period differs across documents, which creates uncertainty about which issuance window should be relied on.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test.

- Baseline reassessment timing, buffer pool coverage, and reversal handling are not stated in available documents.

The monitoring report states that additionality was confirmed by the VVB and that a combined additionality test was used, which supports the project's core integrity case. On the other hand, baseline reassessment is not stated, buffer pool coverage is not found, and reversal events are marked as not addressed, so permanence and baseline robustness are only partly evidenced. The quantified leakage deduction of 10% is a positive sign, but the contradiction with the PDD's zero or negligible leakage treatment weakens confidence in the underlying assumptions.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ A monitoring report is available for the 2009-07-01 to 2012-03-31 period, and the report includes quantified leakage treatment.

- The VVB name and verified versus claimed emission reduction totals are not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency is moderate because the extracted record includes a monitoring report with a defined monitoring period and quantified leakage treatment. However, the VVB name is not stated, and the verified versus claimed emission reduction totals are not available in the extracted record, limiting auditability. The absence of a clearly stated FNRB method and verified usage rate also leaves important MRV elements incomplete.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ Leakage is quantified in the monitoring report with a 10% deduction, which is safer than an unqualified zero deduction.

- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, leaving some dual-claim uncertainty.

Claim safety is mixed. The later monitoring report's 10% leakage deduction is more conservative than the PDD's earlier negligible or zero leakage position, so I privileged the monitoring report because it is more recent and reflects monitored performance. Still, the project is marked CORSIA-eligible and CCP status is not stated, which leaves some residual dual-claim and market-claim uncertainty.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ Two official document types were used, and the monitoring report is dated 2013-09-13, which is reasonably close to the crediting period.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and several important fields are not found in the available documents.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. Only the PDD and monitoring report are listed as evidence documents, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than high. The monitoring report is dated 2013-09-13, but several key items such as the VVB name, buffer pool, baseline reassessment, and verified usage rate are not found in the available documents.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
Leakage	10% deduction with prior contradiction
Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment missing
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status unstated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full verification statement with the VVB name, verified emission reductions, and any corrective action history.

→ Clarify the baseline, leakage, and crediting-period treatment in a reconciled document that explains why the monitoring report supersedes the PDD.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01-07-2009 to 31-03-2012_v3.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_26-04-2009 to 31-03-2012_v1.0.pdf
- PDD_20-05-2009.pdf
- PDD_26-07-2010.pdf
- PDD_08-11-2010.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1700
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1700

Report ID: CM-8157A1D8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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